The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXX OCTOBER, 1944 No. 3

THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY OF THE EARLY ENGLISH DOMINICANS

As mendicants the Dominicans were dependent for their sustenance and maintenance, for the most part, on the voluntary alms of friends and neighbors. To secure this bounty they practised the quest, i.e., the friars would go two by two and beg from door to door in the district of the priory. The gifts in kind or in money thus obtained were then employed in the support of the brethren. Though the English Dominican houses had notable benefactors, especially the kings, the humbler alms of the citizens and commoners were a very important means of daily support.

I. The Quest for Alms

The quest for alms was introduced and practised by St. Dominic himself. Friar Paul of Venice testified at the canonization process that "he saw the blessed Dominic one time going from door to door seeking alms, and he received bread as a poor man, . . ."[1] Dominic would allow the friars to collect only sufficient food for one day. If there was enough on hand, they were not to accept anything that day or send anyone out begging. The general chapter of 1239 modified this regulation so that enough food and wine for a year could be accepted.[2]

---

[1] *Acta canonizationis sancti Dominici*, ed. A. Walz, *Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica,* XVI, p. 166; cf. pp. 144, 161. Hereafter this work will be referred to as: *MOPH*.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 150. *Acta capitulorum generalium,* ed. B. Reichert, *MOPH,* III, 1, 12, 15.

Usually the lay-brothers were sent out to beg,[3] although the clerics also went out at times. The chapter of 1233 in ordering that the brethren should beg their bread as a sign of poverty[4] intimates that sustenance was not the only objective of the quest, but that ascetical motives also came into consideration. Preachers and confessors were prohibited from making the quest while exercising their offices.[5] This was to prevent all suspicion of self-interest in these ministrations. Furthermore, superiors were cautioned by the chapter in 1233 not to give too readily permission to make the quest.[6] The reason for this regulation is found in the high qualities which Humbert of Romans required of the brothers sent on the quest.[7]

The friars were probably sent out only when there was need. Undoubtedly benefactors frequently anticipated the wants of the priory, thus making a begging tour unnecessary. Especially favorable times for the quest were the harvest and vintage seasons. Sometimes it was the custom to stand in the streets or squares crying out for alms. Where this was the case, Humbert demanded that the brother make known to those who passed that he was soliciting for the Friars Preachers.[8]

In making the quest, the brothers were not permitted to go beyond territory marked out for their priory. By agreement with one another, the various houses of a province marked off the limits within which they would carry on their apostolic ministry, and at the same time draw upon the charity of the populace.[9] Evidence of such a division of the English province is found in a conflict which arose between the Norwich and Dunwich priories in 1259. The line separating the territory of the priories was the river between Norfolk and Suffolk, but dispute arose when Dunwich demanded the whole of the parishes of Rushmere and Mendham, parts of which extended into Norfolk. The dispute was arbitrated by William of Nottingham, lector at Norwich, who decided against his own priory, giving the disputed parishes to Dunwich. His decision was guided by norms set up by the provincial chapter held at Gloucester in 1257.[10]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 26, 29; cf. 12, 47. Cf. Humberti de Romanis, *Opera de vita regulari*, ed. J. J. Berthier (Rome, 1889), II, 285.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 32. Indeed, one of the earliest motives conditioning Dominican poverty was the desire of St. Dominic to counteract the false asceticism of the Albigensians who feigned a life of strict poverty (*Libellus Iordani de Saxonia*, ed. H. C. Scheeben, *MOPH*, XVI, pp. 36-37). Cf. H. C. Scheeben, *Der Heilige Dominicus* (Freiburg im B., 1927), pp. 32-37.

[5] *Acta cap. gen.*, I, 12.

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 4.

[7] *Opera*, II, 185: "Eleemosynarius dicitur, qui vel habet petere eleemosynam vel dare . . . sit securus contra omne peccatum, affabilis in verbis, amabilis et honestae conversationis inter homines, qui sufficiat aliqua verba aedificatoria simplicia interdum dicere; prudens in observando, quid et quando, qualiter et quibus petere debeat; non importunus notabiliter in petendo, nec taediosum se reddens hominibus, nec de fructu sui laboris et industriae superbiens inter fratres." Questing was an art not to be entrusted to everyone.

[8] *Op. cit.*, II, 286: "Ubi autem est consuetudo quod petitur eleemosyna panis clamando pro Fratribus debet, sub nomine Praedicatorum et non alio, petere."

II. WARDROBE AND DIET

The simple diet and wardrobe of the early English Dominicans is thus described by Matthew Paris, their Benedictine contemporary:

> These, poor indeed in food and clothing . . . went through the cities, villages, and boroughs preaching the word of the Gospel . . . however they went shod in aid of the Gospel, they slept clothed, used mats for their bed, with sacks for pillows on which to lay their heads.[11]

These observations are confirmed when we consult the legislation of the Order and other sources. The beds were of the rudest, being made of straw, hair, or wool.[12]

The habit of the Order was composed of a tunic, a scapular and hood of white, a black mantle with hood attached, and a belt of leather, from which the friar suspended his handkerchief, knife, and purse.[13] The rosary was added to the habit at a much later date. The lay-brothers, however, hung their paternoster chaplets from their belts.[14] During the winter the friars were permitted by the constitutions to have three tunics and a pelisse, a type of inner garment presumably of sheepskin. If the pelisse were not worn, a friar was entitled to four tunics.[15] Underclothing, leggings, socks, and shoes completed the friar's wardrobe.[16]

---

[9] *Acta cap. gen.*, I, 26, 29, 46-47; cf. pp. 23, 209, 219.

[10] J. Kirkpatrick, *History of the Religious Houses of Norwich* (Yarmouth, 1845), pp. 7-8.

[11] *Historia minor* (RS), II, 66.

[12] *Constitutiones antiquae ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. H. Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, I (1885), I, 200. The skins of animals were authorized as bed covering in the infirmary in 1249 (*Acta cap. gen.*, I, 44, 49, 55). The custom of sleeping fully dressed derives from the practice of St. Dominic, cf. *Acta canonizationis*, pp. 135, no. 13; 145, no. 27.

[13] The general chapters legislated against too many or too rich pendants from the belt (*Acta cap. gen.*, I, 64, 105). Cf. A. Mortier, *Histoire des maitres généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, 1903), I, 607.

Apart from royal benefactions, we have little information as to how the English Dominicans provided their wardrobes. Royal help in this regard, though undoubtedly welcome when it came, was a negligible item if we extend these benefactions over a century's time and consider the few houses which were helped by this bounty. In September, 1233, Henry III gave the London Blackfriars 350 yards of cloth and 100 pairs of shoes, and almost every year between 1241 and 1263 he supplied winter clothing.[17] Other priories shared in this royal generosity to a lesser extent. In 1239 the king supplied tunics and shoes to the friars of the Winchester priory. He provided for them in the same way in 1241, 1242, 1243, and 1244. In 1261 he again sent them £10 to buy shoes and clothing.[18] The Newcastle Dominicans were supplied from the royal purse in March, 1239, with 150 ells of white cloth and 16 pairs of shoes. The following year each friar again received four ells of cloth for a tunic.[19] In 1244 the sheriff of Northampton was ordered to provide each of the friars of that town with five and one-half ells of blanketing for their robes.[20] There is no record as to how the other priories of the province supplied clothing for their brethren, who were probably not as well provided for as their fellow religious mentioned above. However, William of Woodford, a Franciscan, admitted that the English friars were better clothed than those of other countries, noting that this was owing to the abundance of wool in England.[21]

---

[14] *Acta capitulorum provincialium ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* (ed. C. Douais, Toulouse, 1894), p. 515.

[15] *Constitutiones antiquae,* I, 204. Skins of wild animals were not permitted in making the pelisse (*loc. cit.*). On these points cf. Humbert *Opera,* II, 220, 221; I, 237.

[16] Mortier, *op. cit.,* p. 607. Quétif-Echard, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris, 1719), I, 75-77: "De antiquis ordinis Praedicatorum vestibus." P. T. Masetti, O.P., *Monumenta et antiquitates veteris disciplinae ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome, 1864), I, 97-100. All the garments of the friar were to be of wool; linen was expressly forbidden (*Constitutiones, loc. cit.*).

[17] *Calendar of Liberate Rolls, 1226-1240,* pp. 233, 234. *Ibid., 1240-1245,* pp. 87, 204, 273. *Ibid., 1245-1257,* pp. pp. 16, 167. PRO, *Liberate Rolls,* 43 Hen. III, m. 2; 44 Hen. III, m. 2; 46 Hen. III, m. 15. *Close Rolls, 1261-1264,* p. 166. Cf. *Monumenta Conventus S. Mariae et S. Joannis Baptistae, Londinensis,* in *Analecta ordinis Praedicatorum,* III, 294-296.

[18] *Cal. Lib. R., 1226-1240,* p. 431. *Ibid., 1240-1245,* pp. 72, 144, 191, 264. PRO, *Liberate Roll,* 45 Hen. III, m. 7.

[19] *Cal. Lib. R., 1226-1240,* p. 281.

The habit of the Order was the occasion of quarrels with the Franciscans. People learned to distinguish between the two Orders by their footwear, as "Shodfriars Lane" near the Dominicans' site in Boston bears witness.[22] A poet likewise, writing his satiric poem on the "Order of Fair-Ease" toward the end of the thirteenth century, observes that the Friars Preachers do not go barefoot like the Franciscans. *Ne vont come les autres nuyz peez.*[23] Pecham, the doughty Franciscan, in a learned rejoinder to a letter which Kilwardby, the Dominican provincial, had written to some Dominican novices, felt constrained to refute the strictures of the Dominican regarding barefoot evangelists. Kilwardby undoubtedly thought he had scored a good point when he wrote that barefoot friars are not the best fitted for apostolic pilgrimages because they suffer from the extreme cold in the winter, and enjoy the comfort of going unshod in summer. Pecham answered that the cold of winter held no terrors for a Franciscan, while the hot soil of the summer, which burned the feet of the friars, was worse than the discomfiture of shoes.[24] The lesser friars of the two Orders also quarrelled on the subject of clothing. Matthew

---

[20] *Cal. Lib. R., 1226-1240,* p. 368. *Ibid., 1240-1245,* p. 1.

[21] Bodleian Library: *Twyne MS.* XXI, fol. 501. Some of the friars, elsewhere in the Order, received alms in kind or in money from friends or relatives and were permitted to use these for the purchase of clothing or books. The purchase was made through the procurator. Cf. Mortier, *Histoire,* I, 637-638. Masetti, *Monumenta et antiquitates,* p. 102.

[22] Also a deed of 1537 at Newcastle-on-Tyne: " . . . Roland Prior of the ffreres domynyks otherwyse named the schode ffreres or black ffryers . . . " PRO, *Exchequer Accounts,* 315/100.

[23] *"The Political Songs of England",* ed. T. Wright [Camden Society, 1839], p. 146.

[24] *Fratris J. Pecham tractatus tres de paupertate* (*Contra Fratrem R. Kilwardby*). [British Society of Franciscan Studies, II], pp. 112, 129.

Paris, under the year 1243, reports at length and laments the controversy that had arisen between the Dominicans and Franciscans, but we suspect that he was secretly pleased at this strife which had split the ranks of these rivals of "the authentic Orders." Without any delicacy of feeling the Dominicans maintained that "they were more decent in their apparel" than the sons of St. Francis. When the latter replied that they had embraced "a way of living more rigorous and humble, and so the more worthy, because more holy," their adversaries "contradicted them to their face, saying that though the Minorites went barefoot, coarsely clad, and girded with a rope," other points of their life mitigated these austerities.[25] The difference in the clothing of the two Orders appears also in the official documents of the realm. In 1260-1262 the winter clothing of the London Franciscans cost only half as much as that of the Dominicans.[26]

The meals in a Dominican priory were extremely simple and were taken in common.[27] No one was to receive any special treatment in regard to the food served.[28] During the fasting period, which in the Order began on September 14 and lasted until Easter [29], except on Sundays, the community had only one meal a day, which was taken after nones, probably at two or three in the afternoon. The lenten regime was also observed on days of rogation, on about ten or twelve vigils of feasts, and on all Fridays of the year. The evening repast, which was taken before compline, seems to have consisted of liquid alone and required only a short space of time. The constitutions, and the blessing given, made reference only to drink.[30] On Good Friday all fasted on bread and water.[31] Dispensations from this rigorous schedule were given in individual cases,[32] and a more lenient regime was established for the novices and weaker brethren, who were permitted to break their fast in the morning after prime.[33]

---

[25] *Chronica majora* (RS), IV, 279. The fact that the Dominicans wore shoes was seized upon by their opponents as one of the proofs that the Order did not imitate the apostolic way of life, "quia predicatores vadunt calceati, apostoli discalceati, . . . " Thomas of Sutton, O.P., *Contra aemulos fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, in *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, III (1933), 74.

[26] A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History* (Manchester, 1917), p. 60; cf. pp. 56-57.

[27] *Constitutiones antiquae*, ed. Denifle, *ALKG*, I, 198.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 197-198. The infirm and those who had just undergone blood-letting ate elsewhere (*Ibid.*, pp. 198, 200).

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 200: "Et infra lectionem poterunt fratres bibere, . . . "

During the remainder of the year, from Easter till September 14, the friars had two meals a day;[34] the first about noon, the second in the evening before compline. Two dishes were to be served regularly, and the prior could add a third if he thought it necessary and if the resources of the house permitted.[35] Perpetual abstinence from meat was maintained in the refectories of the Order, though a special place was set aside for the infirm who required a meat diet.[36] The chapter of 1236 forbade the serving of flesh meat even to secular servants of the priories.[37]

The beverage of the early Dominicans was probably dictated by the custom of the country. In the English province both wine and beer were used. In September, 1315, the mayor of Leicester, John of Knightcote, sent the Dominicans bread, wine, and beer to the value of 6½*d*, 2*s*., and 6 *d*. respectively.[38] King Henry, in 1247, gave the friars at Northampton two tuns of wine,[39] and in 1263 he sent the Dominicans of Lincoln a cask of wine taken for his use at the fair of St. Botolph at Boston, though on this occasion the wine was for use at Mass.[40] In 1264 a cask of wine was given to the Winchester friars.[41] A gift by the mayor of King's Lynn for the celebration of

---

[31] Observed by custom from the beginning of the Order and prescribed in the "Ordinarium," whence it was transferred by the chapters of 1256-7-8 (*Acta cap. gen.*, 80, 85, 90) to the constitutions.

[32] *Constitutiones*, p. 198. The chapter of 1258 (*Acta*, I, 58) admonished priors not to be too ready to give this dispensation.

[33] Humbert, *Opera*, II, 538, I, 202; *Acta*, I, 58.

[34] *Constitutiones*, p. 197.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 199. Humbert, *Opera*, II, 290. *Acta canonizationis sancti Dominici*, p. 157 no. 38: " . . . vidit multotiens in refectorio, quando fratres habebant duo pulmenta seu duo fercula, quod unico erat contentus."

[36] *Constitutiones*, pp. 201, 199.

[37] *Acta cap. gen.*, I, 4.

[38] *Records of the Borough of Leicester* (ed. M. Bateson), I, 295.

[39] *Cal. Lib. R., 1245-51*, p. 136.

[40] *Close Rolls, 1261-64*, pp. 241, 332.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 332.

St. Dominic's day, 1285, may indicate that in the English province wine was served only on the greater feast days.[42] Elsewhere, too, at least in the earlier years of the Order, wine was not the regular drink. Thus in *The Lives of the Brethren* we read that

> at Bologna the cask of wine for the use of the sick having run short, the infirmarian, after searching in vain for more, went and laid the matter before the brethren, at the same time grieving sorely for his patients, since for the most part only those who were hale drank water.[43]

Even when wine was used, Humbert advised, especially the novices, to dilute it with plenty of water.[44]

III. Aid from the Common People

It seems certain that the chief support of the mendicants came from the donations and alms of the ordinary people. It is hard to cite many direct examples of this, but an analysis of the information we have makes it almost indisputable that the friars could not have existed if they had not found the favor of the people. The experience of the London Dominicans in 1255, when they temporarily lost the good-will of the populace, is very convincing. They and the Franciscans espoused the cause of the Jews who were accused of the murder of little Hugh of Lincoln, and were caught in the wave of indignation and popular feeling against the Jews that swept England at this time. When they begged as usual from door to door no friendly hand supplied their wants, and, as a result of their kindly intervention, they suffered hunger for several days.[45]

A series of events extending throughout the century also shows how important the help of the populace was. At least, it was mainly on account of their alms that the coming of the friars into various localities was opposed. As early as 1228 the Dominicans at Oxford came into conflict with the Canons of St. Frideswide. From the terms of the settlement, we learn that the question of alms and offerings to the friars entered into the trouble. Parishioners of St. Aldate's Church, which belonged to the canons, were not to be admitted to the offertory in the friar's church, and if by chance any of them voluntarily made an offering in the oratory, the gift was to be given to the parish church. The friars were permitted to open a cemetery, but only for themselves and familiars who had served them for at least a year. Only two middle-sized bells were to be hung in the oratory. If any benefactor wished to give land for the enlargement of the house, oratory, or churchyard of the friars, the Bishop of Coventry was to decide the amount of indemnity due to the canons.[46] These terms indicate that the Dominicans had attracted the populace and were beginning to share in their generosity to the detriment of the parish church.

---

[42] C. F. R. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of King's Lynn," *Archaeological Journal*, XLI (1884), 79.

[43] *Vitae fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. B. Reichert, *MOPH*, I, 27-28. Translation by P. Conway-B. Jarrett, *Lives of the Brethren of the Order of Preachers* (New York, 1924), p. 17.

[44] *Opera*, II, 540, I, 197, 223: cf. *Vitae fratrum*, p. 283, concerning the friar who was punished in purgatory for having taken his wine undiluted.

[45] *Annales Monastici* (RS), I, 347.

The liberality of the common people is proved by another interesting episode. The Dominicans had established a priory in Chester, probably through the good offices of Bishop Alexander Stavensby of Coventry and Lichfield. When the Franciscans came to the city in 1236 and attempted to found a house, they were vigorously opposed by the bishop. Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, was drawn into the conflict and wrote a strongly worded letter to Stavensby siding with the Franciscans. From it we learn that Alexander had gone so far as to speak publicly before the people and magnates of the city against the Franciscans because of their desire to settle in Chester. We learn the reason for the opposition when Grosseteste claims that there would be sufficient alms for both priories, since experience had shown that where the two are together there is no lack of abundance for all; for almsgiving is a living spring which pours forth waters all the more abundantly the more it is drawn upon.[47] Alexander was afraid that the Dominicans, for whom he had a special predilection, would not get sufficient alms to support themselves if the Franciscans came to share the field. Evidently the collection of alms was a vital matter; otherwise we cannot explain the stand of Bishop Alexander. In this connection it is interesting to observe that the number of Franciscans in Chichester dropped from forty in 1285 and 1290 to twenty-seven in 1297, perhaps owing to the activities of the Dominicans who had arrived about 1283.[48] There may be a relationship between the two facts, though there were other causes operating to produce fluctuations in the number of friars at the priories of the mendicants.

---

[46] *The Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford,* [Oxford Historical Society, xxviii], I, 205-207.

[47] *Epistolae* (RS), pp. 120-122.

The help the ordinary people extended to the friars is also evidenced by the opposition of the canons of Dunstable when the Dominicans began their house there in 1259. The canons bitterly opposed this establishment, alleging the lack of a royal license[49] but the real reason was that the coming of the friars began to hurt their pocketbook. Matthew Paris makes this point clear in his comment on the proceedings:

> Day after day they erected buildings, and endeavored to increase their possessions, to the great detriment of the house of Dunstable, by raising contributions amongst the neighboring places from which the prior and convent ought to receive revenues. The more the Preacher brethren increased their buildings and enlarged their possessions, so much the more were the possessions and rights of the prior and convent diminished; because the revenues which they had received from the messuages now given to the Preacher brethren, were now lost to them, and these newly-come brethren, by their urgent preachings, entirely usurped the offerings which had been usually given to them.[50]

The opposition of the canons is more readily understood when we recall that for fifteen years previous to the arrival of the Dominicans they had suffered serious and unforeseen curtailments of their usual revenues, chiefly owing to the failure of crops.[51] Father Palmer, however, notes that the canons could not have lost much by way of rents through the arrival of the friars, since at the dissolution the possessions of the latter did not amount to five pounds, while the canons had a rent-roll of £402.[52]

---

[48] A. R. Martin, *Franciscan Architecture in England* [British Society of Franciscan Studies, Manchester, 1937], p. 55, note.

[49] *Cal. Pat. R., 1258-1266,* p. 201.

[50] *Chron. maj.,* V, 742. Translations are taken from J. A. Giles, *Mathew Paris's English History* (London, 1852).

[51] *The Victoria County History of Bedfordshire,* I, 372.

Another example similar to that of Dunstable concerned the Dominican priory at Scarborough. The townspeople welcomed the friars, and in 1252 granted that the effects of the Dominicans and their retainers should be toll-free in the borough.[53] Though the citizens, by their testimony at an inquisition in 1284, defeated a petition of the Dominicans to pull down the town wall between the old and new boroughs and use the stones for their church,[54] they requested the friars to move to a new site,[55] and many contributed to its development.

But despite the favor of the citizens, the Cistercians questioned the right of the Dominicans, as well as of the Franciscans, to settle in the city. The advowson of the parish church was held by them, and they applied its revenues to the expenses of their yearly general chapters. The dispute with the Friars Preachers came to a head in 1278, when Robert, Duke of Burgundy, wrote to King Edward I protesting that the presence of the Dominicans had so cut into the revenues that the Cistercians could no longer meet the expenses of their chapters.[56] On September 14, 1285, the Cistercian abbots, assembled in chapter, sent another complaint to King Edward stating that the Dominicans and Franciscans had entered the town contrary to apostolic and royal prohibitions, and that their presence had caused the revenues of the parish church to diminish to such an extent that instead of supporting the general chapter for three days as formerly they now sufficed for only one.[57] The antagonism of the monks was apparently not appeased, for early in March, 1290, John le Romeyn, Archbishop of York, wrote to the official of the Archdeacon of East Riding requesting him to help the Dominicans in securing the speedy payment of legacies due to them and to direct the Cistercians not to interfere with the preaching of the friars.[58]

---

[52] "The Black Friars of Dunstable," *The Reliquary,* XXII (1881), 11.

[53] L. M. Goldthorp, "The Franciscans and Dominicans in Yorkshire," *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,* XXXII (1936), 406.

[54] *Yorkshire Inquisitions,* II [Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, xxiii], pp. 9-11.

[55] *Cal. Pat. R., 1281-92,* p. 177. *Collectanea topographica et geneologica,* ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1837), IV, 132.

[56] *Foedera conventiones, litterae, etc.,* ed. T. Rymer (London, 1727), II, 110.

[57] *Ibid.,* pp. 313-314.

The cases just cited are proof positive that the Dominicans were drawing a great deal of their support in alms from the common people, so much so that well-established interests, like older religious orders and parish churches, began to experience a notable falling off in offerings. Evidently the same thing was happening repeatedly, the news had gone around, and the vested interests were ready for opposition as soon as a friar put in an appearance within their preserves. In the case of Dunstable, the canons protested even before the friars had made a permanent settlement. To counteract this procedure, the friars began coming into the territories of the older monasteries quietly. At least, Matthew Paris accuses them of coming surreptitiously. According to him they came on the pretext of preaching a passing sermon and with the supposed intention of leaving as soon as it was over, but invariably found some excuse, such as feigned illness, to linger on, set up temporary altars, and ingratiate themselves with the people, so that the older monasteries in order to keep peace and to avoid scandal had to give way and allow them to remain.[59]

He is, however, too ready to excuse the older monasteries. At any rate, when the Dominicans attempted to make their foundation at Hereford, all the vested interests violently opposed their coming, and after a foundation had been made sought by every means to bring it to an end. The first attempt to establish a house was made in 1246,[60] and immediately conflict and litigation with the secular clergy and canons of the cathedral chapter broke out. The plea of the opposition was that the town already had enough applicants for its charity.[61] They were successful in the initial trial of strength, for the Dominicans gave way "out of reverence for the Bishop, Dean and Chapter." [62] But this did not settle the case, and several vain attempts were made to arbitrate. Finally in 1254, probably growing tired of the continual bickering, the friars openly flouted their enemies by pushing on the construction of their priory. Local friends appear to have been enlisted or were ready to help the friars, for the rector of the parishes of All Saints and of St. Martin formally pledged himself not to allow the erection or acceptance of any buildings in his parishes on behalf of the Dominicans.[63] When they began building, the canons and their party appeared in force one night, expelled the friars, and pulled down the unfinished buildings.[64] The case dragged on with various attempts at a solution until the following century when a settlement was reached and the Dominicans were allowed to remain peaceably, although at a different site.[65]

---

[58] *The Register of John le Romeyn, 1289-1296,* I [Surtees Society, cxxiii], p. 211.

[59] *Chron. maj.,* III, 332-333; V, 742.

[60] *Close Rolls, 1242-47,* p. 440.

[61] *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral* [Cantilupe Society, no. 3], p. 85.

[62] *Ibid.,* p. 116.

Previous writers have said little about the contribution of the common people to the development of the English Dominican province. The impression was left that the benefactions of the Crown were all-important.[66] By the very nature of the case the part played by burgesses and townspeople was bound to appear less important owing to the type of their assistance. Few of them were in a position to make large donations, or to aid continually in the support of a house. Furthermore, many records of their gifts have undoubtedly been lost, while the royal benefactions have been faithfully recorded, and the assistance of other groups is commemorated by records, sepulchral monuments, or obit lists. Probably the assistance of the lower classes was much larger than we suspect. The cases recorded above indicate that the daily alms of the people were an important source of revenue — important enough to fight about. This aid was of a humble nature, less remarkable than that of more munificent benefactors, but in the aggregate it was of no small importance in the daily support of the friars and the accomplishment of their mission.

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[65] The friars did not always meet opposition from the older groups. Perhaps the above are only exceptions. In any case, it seems probable that the first possession of the Dominicans in Leicester, the parish church of St. Clement, was given to them by the Canons-Regular of St. Mary of the Meadow. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Leicester," *Transactions of the Leicester Architectural and Archaeological Society* (1884), pp. 5-6.

[66] Cf. B. Jarrett, *The English Dominicans* (London, 1921), pp. 3, 12, 23. A. M. Walz, *Compendium historiae ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome, 1930), p. 231. Mortier, *Histoire*, I, 632.

IV. The Aid of the Crown

The success of the English Dominicans unquestionably owed much to the encouragement and support of the crown. In addition to the foundation of several priories, the royal interest was shown chiefly in the provision of land, money, building materials,[67] food, fuel, and sometimes clothing.

On special occasions the friars shared in the royal largess. Thus on August 7, 1246, the king sent notice to the sheriffs of Oxford and Cambridge to feed all the Friars Preachers and Minors of Oxford and Cambridge in their houses on the day when the obsequies were performed at Oxford for the soul of Isabella, formerly Queen of England and the king's mother.[68] Two days before Christmas, 1244, the king, for the repose of the soul of the Countess of Flanders, prepared a meal for the Friars Preachers, the Franciscans, the poor nuns, the poor of the hospitals, and all the lepers of the city of London.[69] On February 12, 1260, the Dominicans received 2000 herrings as their share of the customary lenten alms distributed by the king among thirty poor religious houses.[70] In 1261 they received 40*s*. as a royal alms to buy fish for Lent.[71]

Likewise during the annual general chapters, when the friars could not expect enough alms from the people of the locality, the king, and at times other benefactors, came to their rescue. Thus in 1238 when the chapter was being held at Lincoln on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, he sent 100 shillings.[72] In July of the following year, the sheriff of Northampton was ordered to supply the necessary victuals to the chapter which was to assemble in September. As the day itself approached, more detailed orders were sent. He was to supply three courses and good wine on the first day of the chapter.[73] In 1247 the sheriff of Lincolnshire was ordered to supply all manner of necessaries in the nature of food for three days for the Dominicans who would assemble at Stamford for their chapter.[74] Similar provisions were made for the chapters 1240, 1241, 1256, 1261, 1286, 1288, 1297.[75] In 1275 Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York, provided for the chapter. He had been approached by Friar Oliver d'Eyncourt, from whom the bishop's official was to learn the needs of the friars.[76] For the chapter of 1286, Queen Eleanor assumed the care of the friars by providing 100 shillings. [77] In 1288, the chapter received an additional aid of 8 marks from the executors of Nicholas of Croyland, former Canon of Chichester.[78] In May, 1250, when the general chapter assembled at London, the king, nobles, and citizens vied with one another in providing food for the gathering. On the first day King Henry came to the priory, asked the prayers of the Capitular fathers, and sat down to the dinner which his own generosity had prepared. The second day the queen supplied food for the chapter. Then in turn Fulk Bassett, Bishop of London, John Mansell, the abbots of Westminster, St. Albans, and Waltham, and the citizens of London provisioned the assembly.[79] During the solemnities that attended the chapter, King Henry gave a mitre to the Master General, John of Wildeshausen, former Bishop of Bosnia.[80] In 1263 the general chapter again met at London.[81] This time 700 Friars Preachers attended,[82] among whom was St. Thomas

---

[67] In this study we will not take into consideration royal benefactions of land, building materials, or money for such purposes.

[68] *Cal. Lib. R., 1245-51,* p. 7.

[69] *Close Rolls, 1242-47,* p. 279.

[70] *Ibid., 1259-61,* p. 238.

[71] *Monumenta Conventus Londinensis,* in *Analecta O. P.*, III, 295.

[72] *Cal. Lib. R., 1226-40,* p. 337.

---

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 403, 413.

[74] *Ibid., 1245-51,* p. 136.

[75] *Cal. Lib. R., 1226-1240,* p. 484; *ibid., 1240-1245,* p. 71; *Close Rolls, 1254-1256,* p. 354; *ibid., 1259-1261,* p. 444; *Victoria County History, Oxfordshire,* II, 111.

[76] *The Register of Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York* [Surtees Society, 109], p. 271.

[77] PRO, *Exchequer Accounts,* 352/7.

[78] *VCH Oxon.*, II, 111. A mark equalled 13*s.* 4*d.*

[79] Paris, *Chron. maj.*, V, 127, and *Historia Anglorum,* III, 80, 314. Nicholas Trivet, *Annales sex Regum Angliae,* ed. T. Hog (London, 1845), p. 238.

[80] *Cal. Lib. R., 1245-51,* p. 288.

[81] *Acta,* I, 117 ff.

[82] *Close Rolls, 1261-64,* p. 196. Probably the greater part of this number were English Dominicans who had assembled for the provincial chapter, which took place on the close of the general chapter.

Aquinas as definitor of the Roman Province.[83] The King proved his generosity by presenting 700 habits to the assembled Fathers.[84]

Some houses received a regular pension from the king. Thus Oxford received an annual grant of 50 marks; Cambridge one of 25.[85] At King's Langley, founded in the fourteenth century, King Edward II supported first 45 friars, then 55, and before 1314 was ended, 100 friars. Under Edward III, 40 friars were provided for at the same house, under Richard II, 60.[86] The Chester priory received 40 pence a week from the royal exchequer. The grant began during the reign of Henry III and appears to have lasted until the dissolution of the priory.[87] In addition to these regular pensions, some houses possessed royal privileges which enabled them to supplement their larders. Thus King Henry III gave the Bristol Dominicans and Franciscans the right to take from each boat entering the port with fresh fish two fresh conger, four fresh milwin (or green fish), eight hake, eight haddock, eight plaice, or four ray according to the catch. They were to be divided among the two priories and delivered to them by the king's serjeant of marine. The grant was renewed by King Edward.[88] The friars of Warwick were given license in 1267 to carry their herring and other provisions freely from Norwich to their priory until Easter.[89] In 1278 King Edward granted the Rhuddlan friars free fishery in the river, and the right to grind their corn at the royal mills.[90]

The kings also made donations to the priories of food or fuel. During the reigns of the first three Edwards, beginning with 1277 and lasting until 1337, royal donations for food were made intermittently. Four pence a day was allotted to each friar, and consequently the amount of the royal alms varies according to the number assigned to each house. Of the forty-eight houses which were in existence during the thirteenth century, we have no record of any royal donations for food in the history of five priories. In the case of the others, seven evidently received such a donation on only one occasion. The other houses received donations for food two, three, or as many as nineteen times. The Ludgate house in London is the exception. It received about forty-one royal benefactions for food. These alms were in no case an annual affair and usually occurred at long intervals.

---

[83] *Monumenta Provinciae Angliae,* in *Analecta O. P.*, III, 551.

[84] *Close R., 1261-64,* p. 196.

[85] *Cal. Pat. R., 1461-67,* p. 286, mentions Henry III as the originator of the Oxford grant; cf. *Enactments in Parliament concerning Oxford and Cambridge* [Oxford Hist. Soc., lviii], pp. 51, 58, 78, *Collectanea,* III [OHS, xxxiii], p. 155. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Cambridge," *The Reliquary,* XXV (1885), 138.

[86] Jarrett, *The English Dominicans,* p. 8.

[87] *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1272-1307,* p. 429. *Cal. Close R., 1272-1279,* p. 142. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Chester," *The Reliquary,* XXII (1882), p. 97.

[88] *Cal. Pat. R., 1281-92,* p. 201.

[89] *Ibid., 1266-72,* p. 43.

[90] *Cal. Chancery Warrants, 1244-1336,* p. 4.

Fuel was supplied to fourteen priories; to London seven times (7 oaks), to Oxford 12 (127 oaks), to Northampton 11 (66 oaks), to Wilton 8 (34 oaks), to Winchester 17 (72 oaks). Winchester also received a total of 130 wagon-loads of underbrush. The remaining nine priories received fuel on five occasions or less.[91]

Thus the stocking of the community larder by the Crown was a sporadic, and in the case of some priories, a unique occurrence. When we include all royal benefactions, i.e., land, building materials, money, food, fuel, clothing, it is found that twenty-three houses received five or more benefactions; twenty less than five; four none at all.[92] It is worth noting that the bulk of Henry III's donations date roughly from the time of his personal ascendancy in the government, i.e., 1236-1258. The London priory at Holborn, and the Canterbury house claimed the chief interest of King Henry, while the truly magnificent and princely benefactions of Edward demonstrated his predilection for the London house, which was now transferred to Ludgate. A consideration of the priories that shared most frequently in the offerings of the Crown seems to indicate that royal benefactions followed no set rule, and were rather the result of circumstance: chiefly the royal presence in certain cities and towns. During Henry's reign Bristol, Canterbury, Gloucester, London, Northampton, Oxford, Stamford, and Winchester were the chief beneficiaries. Under King Edward, Bamburgh, Beverley,

---

[91] After the death of Edmund Rich, the king continued the regular supply of fuel which the archbishop had made to the Canterbury priory, *Close Rolls, 1237-42,* p. 265.

[92] These figures include donations to 1337. The Crown made its greatest contribution to the province in the donation of building materials or money for the construction of the priories, especially to Canterbury and London (Ludgate). In some cases land was provided.

Cambridge, Canterbury, Carlisle, London, Northampton, Oxford, Pontefract, and York were the principal recipients of the royal munificence. Many of these alms were after 1300, and most of the priories were in the North. That no systematic attempt was made to provide for all houses is clear from the fact that out-of-the-way priories like Arundel, Chelmsford, Chichester, Guildford, Scarborough, Sudbury, Truro, and the Welsh houses seldom or never partook of the royal alms.

V. Aid from Other Groups

Apart from the support which came from the common people and the royalty, the Dominicans could also count on assistance from members of the upper classes and from various ecclesiastical personages and institutions.

There is very little direct evidence to illustrate that the wealthy provided for the support of the friars. Hubert de Burgh, Earl of Kent, seems to have made possible the establishment of the London priory at Holborn in 1224, when he gave the friars some property and houses in the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn.[93] He continued to prove a generous benefactor, and among many other gifts made over to the the friars his palace at Whitehall. They sold it to the Archbishop of York, who established his London house there.[94] At his death in 1243, the earl bequeathed to the Dominicans a debt of 124 marks that was owed to him.[95] He was buried in the Dominican cemetery, London.[96] We also have record of the generosity of Thomas Lord Berkeley (1281-1321), who liberally provided for the friars of the Gloucester priory out of his granaries.[97]

The nobility were ready to help the friars in other ways as well. We have an interesting example from 1258. In October the king promised to give the Canterbury Dominicans £32 within a month of the

[93] *Monumenta conventus Londoniensis,* in *Analecta O. P.,* III, 286.

[94] Paris, *Chronica majora,* IV, 243-244.

[95] *Close Rolls, 1247-51,* pp. 231-232. It was collected and paid to them by the command of the King.

[96] Paris, *loc. cit.*

[97] C. F. R. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Gloucester," *Archaeological Journal,* XXXIX (1882), 299.

following Easter. But the friars needed funds, and through the good offices of Simon of Montfort, Earl of Leicester, and Richard of Clare, Earl of Gloucester and Hertford, they obtained on November 12 an order to the officials of the treasury for immediate payment.[98]

Members of the gentry or nobility were associated also, more or less intimately, with the establishment of nineteen priories. We will cite a few examples. Leicester was in the patronage of the Dukes of Leicester.[99] The priory at Pontefract was founded in 1253 by Edmund de Lacy, son of John de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, in honor of St. Richard Wyche of Chichester. He provided the site, and personally laid the cornerstone of the church.[100] At Scarborough, Isabel de Beaumont, second wife of John de Vescy, former governor of Scarborough Castle, built the nave of the church, the cloister, and the dormitory at her own expense.[101] At Bangor, Tudor ap Gronow, Lord of Penmynydd and Tre Castle, was given the privileges and honors of founder when he rebuilt the priory buildings after they had been destroyed by fire *ca.* 1284.[102] From these and similar examples we learn of the interest of the upper classes in the Dominicans. After the priories were built, they must have continued to help the friars with alms and other benefactions.

The favor shown the Friars Preachers by the English episcopacy was demonstrated usually in other fields than the economic. Some of the bishops were appointed by the Pope as protectors of the privileges of the Order in England. Others employed Dominicans in the administration of their dioceses. Exeter priory may have been founded by Bishop William Brewer; at any rate, the house was always under the patronage of the Bishops of Exeter. Elsewhere, we have seen how Bishop Alexander Stavensby aided the Dominicans of Chester.

However, there are a few cases which show that some economic assistance was extended by the bishops. Archbishop Edmund Rich of

---

[98] *Cal. Pat. R., 1247-58,* p. 653. *Liberate Roll,* 43 Hen. III, m. 8.

[99] *Calendar of Chancery Warrants,* I, 264.

[100] *Vita S. Richardi Episcopi,* in *Acta Sanctorum Aprilis,* I, 303.

[101] *Collectanea topographica et geneologica,* IV, 132.

[102] R. C. Easterling, "The Friars in Wales," *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (1914), p. 334; F. R. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Bangor," *The Reliquary,* XXIV (1884), 226.

Canterbury granted a regular allowance of fuel from his woods to the Canterbury Dominicans.[103] Various other bishops made gifts of money and food, or left legacies to the Friars Preachers. In March, 1269, Archbishop Walter Giffard of York granted two quarters of corn, and on June 2, 1271, one mark and two logs of firewood to the priory of Gloucester.[104] The Dominicans of York received one mark from him in September, 1270, and the priory of Dunstable 2*s*. in November.[105] In 1275 he provided all the necessities for the provincial chapter, which convened at York on the Nativity of Our Lady, September 8.[106] Archbishop Wickwane of York granted the house of Beverley ten marks in 1281, and another ten the following year.[107] In 1283 he bestowed £5 in August and ten marks in October on the Dominicans of York.[108] In the following August, they again received £5 from him.[109] Bishop Godfrey Giffard of Worcester, who was one of the conservators for the Dominicans, left the priory of Gloucester a legacy of 40*s*.[110] The same house was the recipient of 6*s*.8*d*. from the Bishop of Hereford in 1290.[111]

The Dominicans received assistance, likewise, from various religious institutions. After 1259, when the Dunstable house was established, the nuns of Markgate gave the friars a dole of loaves until their church should be completed.[112] The Oxford Dominicans received an annual pension of 50*s*. from the monks and guardian of Durham College, Oxford.[113] The favor, if not the assistance, of the monks of

---

[103] *Close Rolls, 1237-42,* p. 265.

[104] *Reg. Walt. Giffard, York,* pp. 119, 124-125.

[105] *Ibid.,* p. 123. J. Raine, *Fasti Eboracenses, Lives of the Archbishops of York* (London, 1863), I, 313.

[106] *Ibid.,* p. 271.

[107] *The Register of William Wickwane, Archbishop of York, 1279-1285* [Surtees Society, 114], p. 323. *Fasti Ebor.,* I, 323.

[108] *Ibid.,* p. 327.

[109] *Fasti Ebor.,* I, 324.

[110] W. Thomas, *Survey of the Cathedral Church of Worcester* (London, 1736), p. 80 [a will, dated 1301].

[111] *Household Expenses of Bishop Swinfield* [Camden Society, 1854], p. 151.

[112] *Gesta Abbatum* (RS), I, 395.

[113] Anthony Wood, *History of the City of Oxford* [Oxford Historical Society, 1890], II, 333, 273.

Christchurch, Canterbury, was undoubtedly secured, since the armorial bearings of the Canterbury Dominicans were those of Christchurch.[114] Also, the Provincial, William Hothum, wrote a letter to the Prior and Chapter of Canterbury, April 16, 1289, in which he thanked them for favors to himself and to the priory at Canterbury.[115]

VI. SELF-HELP

In addition to this outside assistance, the Dominicans provided to a certain extent for their own support. Every priory had its workshops where the lay brothers made and repaired shoes and clothing.[116] Most houses had gardens, orchards, groves, and sometimes vineyards and fish ponds. Undoubtedly some houses were able to sell part of the produce from these sources and thus supplement the alms of the people.[117] The English province conformed to this practice. Most of our evidence is from the sixteenth century, but it is of such a nature that it is undoubtedly valid for the thirteenth. At Rhuddlan in 1534, the prior leased several gardens and an apple orchard; two years later a second apple orchard was leased.[118] When the house was suppressed, the sale of the effects of the priory included kine and pigs.[119] The report of the sale at Bangor mentions "the old building with a little glass and no lead, and only two little orchards."[120] At the suppression of the Ilchester house, it was found that the priory possessed eight apple orchards and a small grove. In the grove and on the property there were 220 ash trees and elms of sixty to a hundred years growth.[121] The inventory at York mentions the brewery and the granary of the priory. There were also orchards and gardens.[122] At Cambridge, the friars had a fish-pond, which still exists in the gardens of Emmanuel College. Similar examples could be cited concerning the other priories, but these are sufficient to indicate how the friars contributed to their own support through the produce of their own gardens and orchards. The groves and trees standing on the priory grounds furnished firewood.

---

[114] *VCH, Kent,* II, 177.

[115] *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Various Collections* (London, 1901), 253.

[116] Humbert, *Opera,* II, 327, 329-330.

[117] *Ibid.,* p. 336. The chapter of 1242 forbade the friars to maintain vineyards or gardens except for their own sustenance (*Acta,* I, 24). An attempt was made in some places to tax the orchards and gardens of the friars, but this was prohibited by Innocent IV. *Bullarium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum* (Rome, 1729), I, 131.

[118] F. R. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Rhuddlan," *The Reliquary,* XXVI (1886), 118.

[119] "Original Documents," *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (1870), p. 2. Palmer, *op. cit.,* p. 119.

[120] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* XIII, i, 1289.

The early English Dominicans probably derived no revenue through rents. If they did, it was in violation of the Constitutions. In 1216 the Order, which had previously enjoyed possessions and incomes, gave up its legal right in these properties, but still retained the rents.[123] In 1220 rents also were renounced.[124] Before these dates the Order was "possessionate", revenues were drawn from properties, rents, and parishes. After 1220 the Order possessed only its priories and their sites. The tendency to stray from this strict rule was vigorously checked by the general chapters.[125] For example, in 1291 the chapter forbade the friars to have mills, houses, or anything in the nature of possessions.[126] The English Dominicans seem to have observed these regulations. At both Oxford and London, when the friars moved to new sites, the old buildings and properties were sold[127] At York, the friars possessed property in Goodramgate, perhaps their first settlement in the city, but they soon sold it to Archbishop Gray.[128]

---

[121] F. R. Palmer, "The Friars-Preacher of Ilchester," *The Reliquary,* XXV (1884), 78-79.

[122] Goldthorpe, "Franciscans and Dominicans in Yorkshire," *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,* XXXII (1936), 386-387.

[123] *Libellus Iordani de Saxonia* (*MOPH,* XVI), p. 46.

[124] *Ibid.,* p. 67. Cf. *Constitutiones antiquae,* in *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte,* I, 222, V, 549.

[125] *Acta cap. gen.,* I, 44-45, 174.

[126] *Ibid.,* p. 263.

[127] *The Oxford Deeds of Balliol College* [Oxford Historical Society, LXIV], pp. 102-103. *Cartulary of St. Frideswide* [OHS, XXVIII], I, 142, 204-205, 216, 223-224. *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Oseney* [OHS, LXXXIX], I, 364. *Monumenta Convent. Lond.* in *Analecta O. P.,* III, 303-304. *Calendar of Charter Rolls,* VI, 299. *Cal. Close R., 1279-88,* p. 428. At London, likewise, the property given by Hubert de Burgh in Whitehall was sold to the Archbishop of York. M. Paris, *Chron. maj.,* IV, 243-244.

Nevertheless, the Order's strict concept of poverty was gradually modified, and more certain sources of revenue were secured. This mitigation set in about the middle of the thirteenth century and progressed until 1475, when the Order was authorized by the Holy See to accept and maintain properties and rents.[129] In 1261, a papal bull allowed the Order to accept revenues for the purchase of ecclesiastical ornaments, vestments, and books.[130] In 1266 friars were allowed to accept inheritances which would have come to them if they had remained in the world. These could be held or converted into money for the maintenance of the community.[131] In 1274 after the attack on the mendicant orders at the Council of Lyons,[132] Gregory X declared that the friars could "accept properties with a safe conscience."[133] The bull *Supra Cathedram* of Boniface VIII, 1299, in obliging the friars to give a fourth of all legacies, bequests, funeral charges,[134] and other donations to the parish church struck a death blow to mendicant poverty. Under these conditions the quest and voluntary gifts were no longer sufficient, and the Order was obliged to seek for fixed sources of income.[135]

VII. Conclusion

The early Dominicans purposely embraced a life of mortification, filled with austerities. The frugality of their lives simplified the problem of satisfying their limited needs in food and clothing. On the other hand, we must remember that the friars had renounced all possessions and fixed incomes. They lived from day to day, depending on the quest and the voluntary alms of the faithful. Even under the most favorable conditions the care of the community must have been a constant anxiety. Such an economic basis for an organized group could have existed only in a friendly atmosphere. The friars lived in a Catholic society whose faith found expression in almsgiving. When we consult maps of mediaeval English monasticism, we are astonished at the many houses of all Orders that covered the country. At the close of the thirteenth century, the mendicant orders alone had about 280 foundations. In one form or another they derived their support from the free-will offerings of the people, appealing to every rank of society, and, as we have seen, they were not disappointed.

---

[128] *The Register of Walter Gray* [Surtees Society, LVI], p. 272n.

[129] *Bull. O. P.*, III, 528. For a detailed treatment of this process cf. H. C. Lambermond, O. P., *Der Armutsgedanke des Hl. Dominikus und seines Ordens* (Zwolle, 1926), pp. 76-98. ,

[130] *B. O. P.*, I, 408.

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 470.

[132] *Bullarium O. P.*, I, 531-532. H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (St. Louis, 1937), pp. 351-353, Lambermond, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81.

[133] Lambermond, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

[134] The English Dominicans derived part of their support from these sources. Legacies and bequests were received from all ranks of society. Examples could be cited, but they would unduly lengthen this article. The bull *Supra Cathedram* is quoted by Lambermond, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[135] Lambermond, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85.

In the case of the English Dominicans, the kings were important benefactors. Their contributions were not regular, except to some priories, but they were a welcome addition to other means of support. The nobility, the gentry, the bishops, and other ecclesiastics, and finally the common people, all contributed to the support of the province. The help of the lower classes was undoubtedly most important. Their numerous small offerings were, in the aggregate, vital in the life of the friars. That the Dominicans could voluntarily choose a life of poverty, divorced from all fixed income and dependent on free-will offerings, and then successfully feed and clothe in England sixteen hundred to two thousand men, is perhaps the best commentary on the vigor and success of their mission. They must have answered a vital need of society to have awakened such sustained and generous gratitude.

William A. Hinnebusch

Providence College

THE EARLY YEARS OF ITALIAN UNIFICATION AS SEEN BY AN AMERICAN DIPLOMAT, 1861 - 1870

ON March 17, 1861, Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia assumed the title of King of Italy. With the exception of Venetia and the surviving portions of the Papal States, the political unification of the peninsula seemed to have been completed. "The united Italy," says a liberal historian, " .... had suddenly become a fact .... that even the apathetic multitude hailed with delight, and that made the reactionaries and the autonomists forget their narrow ideals in the pride of being citizens of a great nation."[1]

There were, of course, some shadows in the general picture. The South had not wished this type of revolution, the clericals were naturally displeased with the subjugation of the Pope's territories, and the peasants throughout the peninsula had displayed a marked apathy as the new Italy was brought to birth and presented cautiously to Europe. On the whole, however, Cavour could look forward to the future with confidence. Much remained to be done, but the first great step had been achieved. The year was 1861, still the bright noontide of moderate liberalism; and men's hopes were still high and their spirits young.

From March, 1861, until his death in 1882 there was stationed in Italy as United States minister, George Perkins Marsh. Throughout this period he reported regularly to Washington concerning conditions in the new kingdom, and his despatches throw much light on the character of the new regime, as seen by an American liberal.[2] There is, from the conservative viewpoint, a special value to his opinions, since they reveal his gradual disillusionment with regard to the new government, and the slow but clearly perceptible shifting of his position from warm advocate to sharp critic of the young Italian state.[3]

---

[1] Bolton King, *A History of Italian Unity, 1814-1871* (London, 1899), II, 182.

[2] Marsh resided at Turin until 1867, when he followed the Italian government to Florence, and later to Rome. He was born in 1801 at Woodstock, Vermont, and died in 1882 in Italy. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1820 and studied law in Burlington, Vt. In 1835 he was elected to the state legislature and became a member of the supreme executive council of the state. From

The general tenor of his observations during his first three years in Italy might be summarized as follows: the task of fusing the various localities into a national whole was progressing successfully; unification brought all kinds of benefits to the Italian people, the future prospects of the new regime were very promising.[4]

He remarked, as one of the most encouraging signs for the future, the enthusiastic support received by the new government from the

---

1843 to 1849 he was a Whig member of Congress, and in the latter year he resigned to become Minister Resident of the United States at Constantinople. In 1852 he was charged with a special government mission to Greece, and, having traveled extensively in Europe, returned to the United States in 1854. Between 1857 and 1859 he served as railroad commissioner for Vermont. He assumed the post of United States Minister at Turin, March, 1861. He published several works, chiefly in the fields of philology and anthropolgy, e.g., *The Origin and History of the English Language* (1862), and *Man and Nature* (1864). He was the recipient of honors from several Italian academies. Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography,* XII, 297-298.

[3] In this essay the quotations from Marsh's despatches have been transcribed from the originals in The National Archives, Washington, D. C. The footnote references indicate: a) the titles of the bound volumes as in the Archives; b) the serial number of each volume; c) name of the minister making the report; d) the serial number of each despatch; e) the date of each despatch at the point of origin.

[4] *Vide passim: Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh (Apr. 3, 1861-Dec. 1, 1863). A typical extract: "Upon the whole, then, Italy seems to me to be now eminently the country of progress, and I believe the establishment of its political unity, which will be consummated by the recovery of the capital from the obscene birds of night [the Clericals!] that have so long hovered there, will be followed by an intellectual activity and productivity which will leave even the mental achievements of modern Germany behind it." (*Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, n.n., Sept. 4, 1861). — This passage is important also as showing Marsh's lack of friendliness towards the papal party, an attitude which greatly increases the value of his subsequent testimony in defence of the papal case. — As an evidence of Marsh's careful habits, cf. the following from a despatch of 1863: "My object [he is referring to a projected trip through the *Mezzogiorno*] is to acquaint myself with the country. The different provinces now constituting the Kingdom of Italy, though under the same government, are . . . . very diverse in the customs and characteristics of the people; and we cannot know Italy by a simple residence in its present capital" (*Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, n.n., Dec. 1, 1863).

peasantry in every part of the peninsula.[5] (This was a claim which at the time not even the liberals themselves were advancing.) In all classes except that of the clericals the sense of nationality was as thoroughly developed and as consciously felt as in any European race. No one, said Marsh, could question the resolution or the ability of the Italian people to accomplish that unity which, as a counterpoise to the overweening weight of the French and Germanic elements in Europe, would be as great a blessing to the general interests of the continent as to themselves.[6]

In 1864 the American minister was still apparently of the same opinion. Italy, he declared, was a large harmonious family, and even the South was distinguishing itself by whole-hearted devotion to the government.[7] To this early testimony of Marsh there attaches a great importance, in view of the change in his views which was soon to come. His reactions from 1861 to 1864 certainly reveal him as willing to see the good points of the new order; and his uncomplimentary remarks concerning the papal and clerical regime show him to be anything but prejudiced in favor of the latter. The gradual modification of his views, therefore, from mid-1864 onward, is all the more worthy of careful study.

---

[5] *Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, No. 28, Oct. 28, 1861. In regard to the Scientific Exposition at Florence, Marsh said in this despatch: "The well-founded expectations of the government as to the beneficial effects of this first common gathering of the Italian people for so many centuries, seem likely to be fully realized, and I have no doubt that the Exposition will give a new impulse to the development of the spirit of nationality which is of itself so rapidly growing up."

[6] *Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, No. 53, Oct. 20, 1862.

[7] "There is no question that the belief in a community of interests, the consciousness of a national life, and the conviction that immense advantages to the whole Italian people have already resulted from the gathering of the different provinces under one political organization, are strong and rapidly growing sentiments throughout the peninsula. This, I have reason to believe, is scarcely less true of Naples than of the rest of the Kingdom. Distracted as the rural districts of Italy are by brigandage and priestly and political intrigues, the recent progress of the city of Naples, and of all the most populous part of the adjacent provinces in material prosperity, in intelligence, in public order and respect for law, has been extremely rapid; and that population seems hardly less attached to the new government than any others of its subjects. . . . Ten years ago Naples and its dependent territory were socially, morally, politically more degraded than Spain . . . . but they have now left Spain far behind them in the march of substantial improvement" (*Italy,* Vol. XI, Marsh, No. 102, Sept. 19, 1864).

In the very despatch mentioned immediately above there is a slightly ominous note. It is not to be denied, he admitted, that there was much dissatisfaction with the policy of the government in many parts of Italy; and political agitators, "Romish," Bourbon, and Mazzinian, were constantly putting the question: What has Italy gained by her pretended unity?[8] It must be recalled, in fairness to the American minister, that his final conclusion in this despatch was that unification was being successfully accomplished. But the disquieting note of the criticism just quoted, arouses our interest; and the change in the sentiments of the American minister began to be even more marked three years later.

In the early spring of 1867 Marsh felt that the surrender of the Trans-alpine provinces, the cession of Nice in 1860, and the convention of 1864, had destroyed the hold of the Savoyard dynasty on the attachment of the Piedmontese people. The traditions of Venetia and Tuscany were republican; and the king and his government had acquired no popularity in the Two Sicilies or in the other territories which had been added to Piedmont.[9] Royalty, therefore, as represented by Victor Emmanuel and his sons, had little moral strength in Italy. If the king was to retain his throne after a political revolution, he would owe his safety to the support of foreign powers and foreign influences.[10] This was a distinct shift of opinion on the part of the American minister, and it became increasingly marked in his subsequent observations.

About a year and a half after the despatch just quoted, Marsh reported a conversation which he had with General Menabrea. The latter complained that although the political unity of all the Italian states was now an accomplished fact, yet their administrative unification was not altogether complete, and, therefore, the government could not display the necessary energy, "since it did not possess the moral support which the possession of material strength supplies."[11] These latter words were the General's, as quoted by Marsh. The Italian leader seemed to be hinting delicately that the people's loyalty required an occasional stimulus from the government's coercive powers, which, unfortunately, were not as strong as desired.

---

[8] *Ibid.* There had been a faint foreshadowing of this idea in one of the laudatory despatches of two years before: " . . . and though Naples and Sicily may possibly, for the time, be lost to the House of Savoy . . . . " (*Italy*, Vol. X, Marsh, No. 53, Oct. 20, 1862).

[9] *Italy*, Vol. XI, Marsh, No. 174, Apr. 10, 1867.

[10] *Ibid.*

In the spring of 1869 Marsh reported a revolutionary outbreak at Milan. Although he depreciated its political significance, yet he admitted that the unpopularity of the government's tax methods might seem to justify the apprehension that any movement supported by the name of Mazzini would produce a widespread agitation.[12] Again, in the spring of 1870, a revolt occurred at Pavia, involving part of the army. Marsh discounted the movement's political importance, but conceded that it was alarming as one of the too numerous facts which showed a great, and, he feared, increasing demoralization among the masses.[13] By May, 1870, the American minister's fears were still unallayed. He regretted to announce that disturbances of the public peace, of the same character as those to which he had already alluded, had been renewed in various parts of Italy. The movements were generally represented as being of a political nature, and as instigated by republican agitators.[14]

This last-mentioned despatch is an example of the transition state of Marsh's opinions at this time. He was not yet convinced that the disturbances indicated any serious lack of popular devotion to the government, and he was inclined to blame them rather on the misrule of the former regimes. But he admitted that the "want of a sound public sentiment in respect to crimes and punishments" would, if not corrected, ultimately prove dangerous to the political and social institutions of the country.[15] Three months later his pessimism had taken on a more sombre color. He noted that the king was fearing a revolution in his kingdom, and the American minister believed that an event such as the downfall of the French Empire would inspire a serious effort to overthrow the monarchy in Italy.[16]

---

[11] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 287, May 20, 1870.

[12] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 287, May 20, 1870. The following is typical of what the Regionalists were saying at this period: "Impartial history will record . . . . the deplorable state to which Tuscany has been reduced by the new regime . . . . She has experienced . . . . the ruin of her finances; the dismissal of the most worthy and most intelligent of her officials; vexations; perquisitions; *processi economici* with no opportunity to present a defence; sentences of exile; stoppage of pensions acquired by many years of service, as at Fineschi and Buccella; and finally, that which is condemned even at Constantinople, the sequestration of private property, as occurred at Bargagli". *Tumulti in Firenze la sera del 6 giugno 1861, ottava del Corpus Christi; storia contemporanea, descritti per un da Firenze, testimonio oculare* (Florence, 1861), p. 23.

[13] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, cipher portion, No. 299, Aug. 26, 1870.

[14] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 287, May 20, 1870.

It was gradually becoming evident to Marsh that unification had produced two unforeseen and unfortunate results, which might be expressed thus: the exigencies of establishing a highly-centralized government had demanded the imposition of heavy taxes of various kinds on the provincial populations, and the government's agrarian policy had involved a radical reorganization of the system of land tenure. Both these necessities were highly unwelcome to the inhabitants of the rural districts. The government was between two fires; it must maintain its financial stability and it must carry through its program of land reapportionment, but both these objectives involved the cooling of popular loyalty to the State.

The American diplomat's first extended reference to taxation appeared in a despatch of January, 1868. Prince Carignan, acting as regent for the king (who was leading his troops in the Austrian war), was invested by parliament with full powers to launch a "national" loan, which, as Marsh remarked significantly, was popularly called a "forced loan." The American observed that this seemed to have been a "somewhat anomalous proceeding, the constitutionality of which, however, is, I believe, admitted by Italian jurists."[17] We are given no important details concerning the character of this tax, but the manner in which it came into being evidently conflicted with Marsh's American constitutional prepossessions. Perhaps it is not too bold to surmise that it occasioned an analogous reaction in the minds of many Italians.

Not until a few months later did Marsh give a really vivid picture of the tax methods of the new regime. In the spring of 1868 the government imposed a tax on grist, i.e., milled grain, the most common staple of the poorer classes, the basic ingredient of bread. This

[15] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 287, May 20, 1870.

[16] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, cipher portion, No. 299, Aug. 26, 1870.

[17] *Italy,* Vol. XII, Marsh, No. 200, Jan. 20, 1868.

measure, said the American minister, involved the imposition of new burdens on an already over-taxed people, and had occasioned some manifestations of discontent.[18] He explained that the tax was "designed expressly to compel contributions from classes whose utter poverty generally secures them from the exactions of the tax gatherer."[19] Six months later he described in greater detail the nature of this levy and the results which it produced. The tax on grist, he said, had produced some of the effects anticipated by its opponents, the enforcement of the law imposing it was resisted by the populace in many places, and the government was resorting to military force to put down the disturbance.[20]

While the American minister was not gravely alarmed, he declared, nevertheless, that the government was seriously worried as to the results, and was reported to have made large concessions to the independent and spirited populations of Piedmont and Lombardy. In the Romagna the tax was being enforced by "measures which do not fall much short of martial law."[21] Marsh reaffirmed his belief that resistance to the law had not yet assumed a political aspect, but he feared that it would do much to weaken the moral influence of the regime, and that it would demoralize the people and dispose them to listen to revolutionary agitators.[22]

All this is revealing, and is quite in contrast to the American minister's optimistic reflections of a few years before. There is presented here no picture of an Italy united in a communion of national sentiment and loyally devoted to the government. Rather, the government appeared to be losing rapidly the affections of its subjects. The following description of the grist tax makes clear why this should be so:

> The tax on grist . . . . appears to me highly impolitic, unjust, and oppressive, its object being, like that of the *octroi* duty at the city gates, to spare the rich by extorting a contribution from those who have no property to tax, and whose daily earnings are scarcely sufficient to furnish them with the barest necessaries of life.[23]

---

[18] *Italy,* Vol. XII, Marsh, No. 210, May 16, 1868.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Italy,* Vol. XII, Marsh, No. 239, Jan. 6, 1869.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid.*

Marsh explained that the poor in Italy could afford little or no animal food, and, therefore, had to subsist almost exclusively on various preparations of meal and flour. The heavy tax on these staples was an impost on their minimal means of existence.[24] Under the circumstances it was not surprising that the lower classes of Italy should lack something of enthusiasm for the new government.

The new regime's land policy, also, had proved to be unpopular with the peasants and lower *borghesia.* With the double aim of breaking the feudal monopolies — especially that of the clericals — and of modernizing the conditions of tenure, the state had, in 1860, destroyed the large holdings and distributed them in small portions among what, it was hoped, would be a new progressive class of small owners. The results, however, belied the anticipations of the politicians. In the first place the new owners found, to their dismay, that their new status of free proprietorship brought them far less economic advantage than they had experienced under their former condition of tenantship. Marsh explained why this was so:

> There is, especially in Tuscany, another consideration which operates with some force to repress the ambition of land-holding among the laboring class. Farming lands are [i.e., have been] in the past almost universally let upon shares and upon terms so favorable to the cultivator that he would in general be a loser by exchanging tenantship for proprietorship.[25]

The leases under the old tenant system were, indeed, always for a single year, and the landlord could dismiss his tenant by a notice given in the autumn; but the peasant found it to his interest to give satisfaction to the proprietor, and changes were by no means frequent.[26] Marsh cited instances of peasant families who had held the same farm, on annual lettings, for four or five centuries.[27] In the second place, there was the unexpected fact that the peasants in many localities were unwilling after 1860 to receive their land portion, precisely because it had been confiscated from the clergy:

---

[24] *Italy,* Vol. XII, Marsh, No. 239, Jan. 6, 1869.

[25] *Italy,* Vol. XI, Marsh, No. 187, Aug. 16, 1867.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid.*

> In the Alpine and northern Apennine regions the rural population is comparatively independent of the clergy, and there is good reason to believe that the peasantry will largely avail themselves of the opportunity of escaping from the condition of tenants and becoming landowners . . . . But in Tuscany . . . . and in Sicily, it is very doubtful whether many of them will venture to incur the animadversion of the church by appropriating to their private use lands long set apart for the benefit of the priesthood.[28]

Incidentally, it is pertinent to ask the question, would clerical influence have been still so operative, if it had not been based on a yet-enduring affection of the people for the clergy?

Such, on Marsh's testimony, was the general character of the government's financial and agrarian administration. It seems safe to surmise that the defects of that administration go far to explain the popular dissatisfaction remarked by the American minister in the later years of the sixties.[29] There had been no lack of prophets foretelling these results. Federalists like Proudhon, Perez, Regnault, and Chevillard, had pointed out the evils of centralization as exemplified in France, and had warned the Italians that a similar form of government would bring the same disadvantages to the peninsula. The prophets were, apparently, being vindicated by the grumblings and complaints in the provinces of the south, the center, and the north.[30]

---

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] Marsh's strictures were confirmed by the official *Il bilancio del regno d'Italia negli esercizi finanziari dal 1862 al 1912-1913* (Roma, Tipografia dell' Unione editrice, 1914). The following are some of the more significant facts to be noted from this publication: 1) The imposts lightened or removed in 1879 and 1880 were replaced by others almost as heavy (pp. 33-34). The *proventi tributari* which in 1877 were 17 billion lire, leaped in 1888-89 to 287 billion (*ibid.*). 2) The increased public expenses consequent on unification far outran the capacity of the treasury, so that the national budget never was balanced permanently until 1906 (pp. 11-24). 3) Heavy taxation was an urgent necessity in order to prevent the financial system of the State from collapsing entirely (pp. 27-40). Cf. in detail, the following sections of this work: "Prospetti riassumenti le entrate e le spese accertate per gli esercizi finanziari dal 1862 al 1912-1913" (pp. 402-576); "Entrate e spese effettive" (pp. 27-51); "Le entrate effettive ordinarie" (pp. 89-91); "Redditi patrimoniali" (pp. 92-96); "Imposte dirette" (pp. 97-104).

There remains to be considered the new regime's ecclesiastical policy, according to which the real value of the revolution of 1860-1870 must largely be judged. The moderate liberals, who carried through the unification of Italy, always claimed that they never sought to cripple the Church as a spiritual institution, nor to infringe upon any of her spiritual rights. This may have been true. But many of their measures had precisely these effects, whether intended or not. The aim of the Italian government was, confessedly, to subordinate the Church to the State without destroying the independence of the Church in the latter's proper sphere of the spiritual. But in this program there was a fatal fallacy. To subordinate the Church to the state so as to make the State the supreme and last arbiter in matters of disputed or doubtful jurisdiction between the two powers — this was effectually to destroy the independence of the Church as a corporate institution.

The Italian liberals held that the State, after vindicating its position as grantor of the Church's right to exist as a society within the state, would then allow the Church freedom to exercise its spiritual functions. But this was a mere quibble; for the State, if it had the power to confer the former right, had certainly the lesser power of restricting at will the Church's activity. If the State could give being to a society, the State could certainly and rightfully control the acts of its own creature.

So, even though the Italian government had no explicit intention of destroying the Church's spiritual freedom, such would be the logical effect of the government's policy. The present writer, however, in the light of the evidence presented by Marsh, believes one might make a more weighty charge: it would seem that the Italian government deliberately sought to cripple not only the temporal influence and prestige of the Church, but her purely spiritual activity as well. The following extracts from the despatches of the American minister tend to prove that the direct and deliberate aim of the rulers of Italy was to destroy the Catholic Church in Italy in her purely spiritual character.

---

[30] Cf. the following French writers against political centralization: P.-J. Proudhon, *La fédération et l'unité en Italie,* 2nd ed. (Paris, 1862); Elias Regnault, *La Province, ce qu' elle est; ce qu' elle doit être* (Paris, 1861); Jules Chevillard, *De la division administrative de la France, et de la centralisation* (Paris, 1862).

In the fall of 1861 Marsh had a private interview with Baron Ricasoli on the subject of religious liberty in Italy. At the moment the status of the Church-State question was this: the Pope had refused to negotiate on the basis of the "free Church in a free State" plan, and the government's intention henceforth was to break down gradually by means of an attack, under strictly legal forms, all papal and clerical opposition to the state claims.

The baron, after observing that "the papacy, considered as a temporal power, was the great enemy to the liberation of Italy, and to its political, moral, and social prosperity," continued in an even more forthright vein:

> It was moreover mischievous, he said, not only in its character of a territorial sovereignty, but *as a spiritual power relying upon coercion for its influence and support* . . . . Religion ought never to be clothed with any authority to enforce its dogmas or its precepts.[31]

The implication here is clear: the spiritual freedom of the Church was to be attacked, for the good of Italy. The baron was making a clear-cut distinction between the purely temporal and the spiritual or religious character of the Church.

Marsh further clarified Ricasoli's meaning. After noting the view of many that the deprivation of the Pope's temporal power would increase his purely spiritual authority, the American went on to say that this, however, was not the view of the "most enlightened" among the liberals, nor was it their desire. They were ready, he believed, "to denounce the doctrine of coercion and restraint in religious matters altogether." They expected, under all circumstances, a diminution of the *spiritual power and influence* of the papacy and of the clergy, and were ready to accept a constitution which would place every form of religious belief on a footing of absolute equality in the state. It was, he said, very generally admitted that religious servitude and civil liberty could not long co-exist.[32]

It is needless to point out that in the language of nineteenth-century liberals, such expressions as "the doctrine of coercion and restraint in religious matters" meant simply the doctrine which asserted the right of the Catholic Church to exercise, in matters of faith and morals, effective and independent jurisdiction over her subjects. This jurisdiction is absolutely essential for the exercise of her spiritual functions; this jurisdiction the Italian government, on Marsh's testimony, sought to destroy.[33]

---

[31] *Italy*, Vol. X, Marsh, Private, Turin, Sept. 4, 1861: "Notes Private and Confidential for the Hon. Mr. Seward." [Italics inserted.]

[32] *Italy*, Vol. X, Marsh, n.n., Sept. 4, 1861.

During the carnival festivities of March, 1862, the American minister noted the "manifestations of popular detestation not only of the Papacy as a temporal power, but of the whole moral machinery of the Romish Church."[34] If this detestation was really "popular," it would supply an argument of some weight against the clerical regime. But popular demonstrations, particularly at that period in Italy, have frequently proved to have been more synthetic than sincere. But the real point of the remark is this: it reflects Marsh's mind, and his idea of what the people *should* be detesting; and Marsh's mind, as we know from the whole tenor of his despatches, was with regard to the matter, in agreement with the mind of the leaders of the Italian government.[35]

Finally, the rulers' aim of destroying the spiritual power of the Catholic Church in Italy was indicated by the results of that policy, and by the American minister's approval of those results. He declared that the "moral emancipation" of the people from the influence of the Church of Rome was rapidly progressing. The lower clergy, to a very great extent, he said, were throwing off the yoke of the papacy, and a very large number of priests in southern Italy were openly advocating the formation of a national church which, though certainly not Protestant in a theological sense, would be virtually independent of the Roman See, and politically hostile to the "claims of the Roman See to civil *or ecclesiastical* supremacy."[36]

---

[33] For the liberals' view on this subject, cf. R. De Zerbi, *Chiesa e stato e il libro dell' on. Minghetti* (Naples, 1878). The author presents his theory of the State as tutelary of all other societies' rights, and holds the "relative" and non-divine character of the Church's rights. The unescapable conclusion from this book is that the State, in effect, controls (i.e., claims to control) the exercise of the rights of the Church completely. Further, the author openly asserts the State's right to intervene in religious matters (pp. 38-39).

[34] *Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, No. 39, Mar. 10, 1862.

[35] Add the two following extracts: "There are no statesmen in Italy who do not believe that the exercise of not merely temporal sway but of *any* species of coercive authority by the papacy or by any other ecclesiastical jurisdiction is absolutely irreconcilable with the existence of the new order of things" (*Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, No. 49, Aug. 5, 1862, italics Marsh's).

If language has any meaning, this signifies a clear and explicit intention on the part of the government to extinguish the Catholic Church as a spiritual force in Italy.[37]

It is in vain that the liberals should have attempted to attenuate the significance of such statements by saying that they meant merely the reduction of the temporal or "moral" influence of the Church, and, to a greater degree, her "ecclesiastical supremacy;" for the Church's moral influence and ecclesiastical supremacy are precisely what the Church lives by, precisely *her spiritual function acting,* precisely the indispensable requisites of her spiritual independence. To destroy these to the extent of raising up a new "national church" in Catholic Italy was to destroy the Church as a free spiritual institution in Italy.[38]

---

[36] *Italy,* Vol. X, Marsh, No. 53, Oct. 20, 1862. [Italics inserted.]

[37] An evidence of the substitute morality and religion which, at least in the more radical quarters, was being urged, is seen in the rather grotesque *Catechismo Garibaldino,* from which the following are some extracts:

"Q. Make the sign of the cross.
A. In the name of the Father of my country, of the son of the people [the references are to Garibaldi] and of the spirit of Liberty, amen!
Q. Who has created you a soldier?
A. Garibaldi has created me a soldier.
Q. For what end?
A. To honor, love, and serve Italy.
Q. How does Garibaldi reward those who love and serve Italy?
A. With victory.
Q. What are the joys of victory?
A. To behold Garibaldi, and all sorts of pleasure with no sorrow.
Q. Who is Garibaldi?
A. Garibaldi is a *spirito generosissimo,* blessed of heaven and earth.
Q. How many Garibaldis are there?
A. There is only one Garibaldi.
Q. Where is Garibaldi?
A. In the heart of every loyal Italian . . . .
Q. How many persons are in Garibaldi?
A. In Garibaldi there are three persons really distinct — the Father of his country, the son of the people, and the spirit of Liberty!
Q. Which of these three persons became man?
A. The second, that is, the son of the people.
Q. How was he made man?
A. He took a body and a soul, as we did, in the most blessed womb of a woman of the people."

The moral effect of this practical equating of Garibaldi with the Divinity can be easily surmised. The full title of the work is: *Catechismo Garibaldino; istruzioni da farsi ai giovanetti italiani dai 15 anni* (Milan, 1866).

It is to be noted that the clericals and their supporters were not easily overcome. The papal *Syllabus* of 1864 was received by large masses of Italians with a respect which, to the government, was exceedingly disturbing, and which, to historians, should be a warning urging them to recheck their evidence concerning the degree of popular support accorded to the anti-clerical policy. The strength of the Catholic party was indicated by the failure of the Free Church Bill, and by the Senate's rejection of the proposals of 1865 and 1866 for more suppressions of monasteries and convents. The government was forced to work for what would be, at least on the surface, a compromise — pensions to the clergy as compensation for their confiscated properties, and even bribes to the bishops. The fact was that the government, in seeking to break the power of the Church, was obliged by the unexpected vigor of the Catholic opposition to employ greater caution, even at the risk of displeasing the more rabid of the anti-clericals.

---

[38] That this was the government's aim was certainly believed by the parliamentary deputy, Guerrieri Gonzaga, who rejoiced that the Italian State, after its occupation of Rome, "will *no longer have a rival in the religious and ecclesiastical sphere,* except that of a generic integration of the religious activity of private citizens and of private associations" (*Diritto,* Turin, Oct. 15, 1862, italics inserted). To reduce the Church to such an "integration . . . . of private citizens" meant, in plain words, to destroy the independent corporate existence of the Church. Signor Gonzaga continued: "The state cannot rest on a peaceful and secure foundation until it has succeeded in *infusing into the despotic Church that same liberal spirit and the same modes of governing* which are of the essence of the political order" (*ibid.,* italics inserted). Obviously, this is a declaration of a determination to tamper considerably with the purely spiritual constitution of the Church. The United States, thought Gonzaga, had erred in conceding too much liberty to the Catholic Church: "The weakening in the United States of the ancient Protestant tradition, and the supreme prevalence there of the spirit of individual freedom has worked to the disadvantage of the authority and solidity of the state, and opened the way for the usurpations of the Church. The benefits which the Romish Curia has been able to derive in the United States from the liberty originally won by the Protestants in that country, constitute a damage to that Republic, are an attack on her traditions and future, and point a warning to other nations" (*ibid.*). This is indeed a tribute to American free government from an unimpeachable source.

The liberal journal, *Il Pungolo,* urged that education in Italy should be completely divorced from religion: "Education should be made independent of religion . . . . It is an evident fact that there cannot be conceived a good system of studies unless that system is totally independent of all religious elements . . . . " (No. 48, Aug. 6, 1859).

The anti-clerical program was all the more anomalous in view of the fact that Italy was still overwhelmingly Catholic. This was admitted and even boasted of by the king himself, who, referring to the opening of the negotiations with Rome in the fall of 1865, professed his "desire to satisfy the religious interests *of the majority* of his subjects."[39]

The last portion of Marsh's testimony during the years 1861-1870, deals with the Italian government's seizure of the city of Rome. At the beginning of 1870 the determination to occupy without delay the Eternal City was agreed on by the Lanza cabinet. The necessity of placating Napoleon III had been rendered an anachronism by the outcome of the Franco-Prussian war. Pius IX was deaf to all offers of compromise, for he knew that no compromise offer would include the retention by him of his sovereign rights to his territories. After some transparent efforts to legalize the seizure, the troops of General Cadorna entered the Porta Pia on September 20, 1870, and Italy had won her capital.

Marsh's comments at this time have considerable value, principally for two reasons: first, they indicate the existence of a strong popular opposition to the government's policy toward the Church, and, secondly, they reveal that the policy, at least in regard to its Roman aspect, was decidedly condemned by the American minister himself. First, as to this popular opposition.

Marsh, writing in January, 1870, said that the Italian statesmen believed that "not merely resistance to Rome, but any substantial reform in the Roman Church . . . . by the government, *would not be sustained by the people* unless such action of the government was sanctioned by the Italian prelacy and episcopate."[40] This statement could have only one meaning: the government realized that its church program did not enjoy popular support except insofar as it could be approved by the bishops.

---

[39] *Opinion,* Nov. 18, 1865, enclosed in: *Italy,* Vol. XI, Marsh, No. 127, Nov. 18, 1865, italics inserted.

[40] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 276, Jan. 10, 1870, italics inserted.

With regard to the seizure of the city of Rome, Marsh's views may be summarized thus: it was necessary for the welfare of Italy that Rome be taken, but the government's previous commitments with France, and the specific methods employed in the seizure, were illegal—and as such, he thought, to be condemned—and there was no indication that they accorded with the wishes of the Roman people.[41] By the Convention of 1864, said the American minister, Italy admitted the right of France, and by implication, of every other Catholic power, to interfere in the relations between the kingdom and Rome. The ministry weakly failed to denounce the return of the French troops in 1867 as a breach of the convention by France, and "it is not easy to see on what principle Italy can now occupy Rome, without the consent of the Pope, if not also of the government of France."[42]

Furthermore, there had always been a professed hope that when the incubus of the French occupation was withdrawn, there would be a spontaneous rising of the Roman people, imposing enough in its character to paralyze the opposition of the papacy to the annexation of the Papal States to the kingdom of Italy. The advocates of the convention, at the time of its promulgation, encouraged the belief that the Emperor of France looked forward with satisfaction to such an event, and even that the real object of the convention was to facilitate the acquisition of Rome by Italy, by means of a revolution effected by the Romans themselves. This, it was alleged, would be no breach of the convention, nor would it authorize a renewal of French occupation.[43]

[41] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, No. 299, Aug. 26, 1870. The liberal journal, *Corriere di Milano,* made at this time a remarkable admission concerning the strength of the Catholic party in Italy. It would be unwise, said the *Corriere,* for the government to grant universal suffrage, for in universal suffrage the Catholic party would find a support. The majority, counted head by head, lives in the country districts [*campagna*], and the country districts favor the *curate.* The article concluded with the naive reflection that, "therefore, the government's opposition to universal suffrage arises not from self-interest, but from a sincere love of liberty" (*Corriere di Milano,* Feb. 11, 1869).

[42] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 299, Aug. 26, 1870.

[43] This whole paragraph is a paraphrase of part of the despatch No. 299, cited immediately above.

But Marsh had no faith in the soundness or sincerity of this opinion, and he declared that,

> in any event, there are at present no indications of a disposition, on the part of the Roman people, to resort to energetic measures for the overthrow of the pontifical government.[44]

The Italian government, Marsh continued, was concentrating on the Roman frontier a military force far greater than would be necessary to overcome any resistance which Rome could make. This display, he thought, was "designed to afford a moral support to possible popular movements in the Roman territory,"[45] and it was even rumored that an insurrection was in the first stages of preparation,

> . . . though there is no evidence that the people of the city or country are now ready to participate in it.[46]

Marsh in a later despatch repeated his view that the Italian government could not invade the city of Rome without the violation of legal obligations. By the first article of the Piedmontese Constitution of 1848, he recalled, the state was pledged to the exclusive maintenance of the Catholic religion; by repeated ministerial and royal declarations it was pledged to the absolute separation of Church and State and the recognition of absolute equality of rights in different religious sects; and by the Convention of 1864 it had admitted the right of foreign intervention between itself and the papacy, and had "pledged itself to defend the pontifical territory against any assertion of right by the Italian people."[47] The final conclusion of the American minister was, that Italy could not take Rome without a violation of all these solemn promises. The government, he affirmed, had no friends among the states of Europe, and, in a European congress, could not count on a single vote upon any of the issues between the Italian state and the Pope.[48]

---

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 299, Aug. 26, 1870. An apparently valid indication of the Romans' loyalty to Pius IX in 1870 was furnished by a memorial offered to the pontiff on the occasion of his jubilee in July of the following year. The memorial contained the signatures of approximately one-half the male population of the city. The conditions under which the signatures were secured, as well as the admitted integrity of the sponsors of the plan, lend considerable credibility to the theory that this was a sincere and spontaneous expression of esteem. Cf. *Sopra la soscrizione romana raccolta ed offerta a Pio IX P. M. in occasione del suo Giubbileo pontificate, dalla società per gl' interessi cattolici, osservazioni di* C. M. Curci d. C. D. G. (Roma, 1871).

[47] *Italy,* Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 301, Sept. 9, 1870.

The American minister believed that the seizure of Rome was, at the critical moment, dictated by "popular violence" employed against a weak ministry which, in the matter, was vacillating to the point of sheer paralaysis.[49] His final judgment, as well as his appreciation of the essentially *Realpolitik* character of the men who made Italy, was well expressed in a passage written in late 1870. He remarked that one now often heard men of a certain standing in public life say that the quality of the formal stipulations of an arrangement with the papacy was of no importance, because in practice those stipulations would be a dead letter, and the government would be administered in entire independence of the papacy, however strongly the government might bind itself to respect the stipulations.[50] This view of the subject, thought Marsh, indicated a low political morality, but it was very likely to find favor with many who looked upon the possession of Rome as opening a new epoch in the national life which could not be inaugurated at too high a price.[51]

The American minister, in other words, watching his friends consolidate their seizure of Rome, approved, on the whole, what they had done, but he was considerably shocked at what he regarded as the illegality and immorality of their methods.[52] Viewing the scene with an American's respect for acquired and legal rights, his aversion for papalism was overcome by his dislike for the high-handed policy of the Italian liberals.

---

[48] *Italy*, Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 301, Sept. 9, 1870. The success of the Italian politicians in overcoming any scruples connected with pledge-breaking is suggested by the following: "Although the Italian ministry pledged itself to carry out the 'national program' at the session of the senate three weeks ago, the President of the Council solemnly assured the senate that the government would in no case resort to force, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, early last week, declared, in the most explicit manner, to eminent statesmen opposed to the movement, that the Italian troops would *never* enter Rome, and that they would simply occupy strategic points, none of which would probably be within twenty miles of the city" (*Italy*, Vol. XII, Marsh, Sept. 21, 1870, italics Marsh's).

[49] *Italy*, Vol. XIII, Marsh, No. 303, cipher portion, Sept. 12, 1870.

[50] *Italy*, Vol. XIII, March, n.n., Oct. 27, 1870.

[51] *Ibid.*

As to the general picture which Marsh presented of the first decade of rule by the new government, this much may be said: the honeymoon period was over, and domestic disunion, inefficiency, and suffering were beginning to appear. There were clearly visible, also, the outlines of a theory of administration which has in our day become known as the method of the totalitarian State, a method which seeks to dominate all other societies within the national boundaries. This was the New Italy; but it had not brought to the people a freer, larger, and happier life. And the people, apparently, were aware of this. The wind was rising; there were ominous signs in the sky.

Joseph T. Durkin

Georgetown University

---

[52] The *Civiltà Cattolica* made these charges against the Roman plebiscite of October 2, 1870: "We have noted, in studying the foreign press, that therein [no references are given] the Roman plebiscite is censured on four main points: 1) on the day of the voting there were present in Rome from all over Italy many thousands of non-Romans; 2) antecedent to the voting there were not compiled electoral lists, wherefore anyone could vote on that day, and repeat his vote as often as he pleased; 3) several foreigners actually published in English and German journals the statement that they had been admitted to the voting, and had voted several times; 4) the voting did not begin until mid-morning, and the results were announced promptly that evening, a rapidity impossible if an honest count were taken" ("La fedeltà dei Romani al S. Padre", *Civ. Catt.*, Ser. VIII, III (1871), 531).

MISCELLANY

I

A CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN CHURCH ON ITS ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY

When one surveys the extent of the commitments made by the Catholic Church of the United States to the foreign missions in the generation before the present war, it is difficult to believe that these vast achievements have practically all come about within the last quarter century. True, there were individual American priests and religious in the foreign mission field before World War I, but their numbers were relatively few and the movement as such within the American Church had not yet become a real force. There were not lacking those who felt the American Church should participate in the propagation of the faith in the pagan world. Among these was Herbert Vaughan, future Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who was himself famous for his interest in the foreign missions. When Cardinal Gibbons sent an invitation to the Bishop of Salford to attend the centenary of the American hierarchy in Baltimore on November 10-12, 1889, and the inauguration of the Catholic University of America at Washington on November 13, that invitation called forth a remarkable challenge to the Cardinal of Baltimore and the American hierarchy to realize their obligations to the task of the Universal Church. Neither Vaughan nor Gibbons need any introduction to readers of this journal. For the permission to make a copy of the letter, the writer is grateful to the Right Reverend Joseph M. Nelligan, Chancellor of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America

S. Joseph's College, Mill Hill[1]
Feast of SS. Simon & Jude, 1889.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL:

I desire to express to your Eminence my sincere regret, at not being able personally to take part in the great national festival which you are celebrating in commemoration of the foundation of the American Church.

---

[1] Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 86S8.

Nothing, I assure you, but an imperative duty to the interests of the flock in my Diocese, could have kept me at home upon this occasion. During these weeks the important question of Technical Education for the operative classes of Manchester, will be treated & determined by the great public bodies that have taken it up. I am bound therefore, to be on the spot, for the future of no people can be more affected by this question than that of our own. Being thus hindered myself, I have ventured to send one of my Canons, Mgr. Gadd, to represent me, as a mark of the respect which I bear to the American hierarchy, and as a token of my gratitude for having been allowed to take some little part under several Bishops, in the evangelisation of the American negroes.[2]

Had it been my good fortune to have been with the American Bishops upon this occasion, there is one thought above all others that I should have striven to give utterance to. I know you would have pardoned me — for I know that the American people welcome the expression of all thoughts, of all projects, that are intended to promote the welfare & happiness of mankind.

That thought presses so forcibly upon me, that I make bold to declare it to your Eminence, & to submit it, for what it may be worth, to my venerable colleagues in the Episcopate. You are completing your first centenary of existence as a Church. You are passing out of infancy and are beginning to exhibit the gigantic powers and energies which seem to be the birthright of your northern continent. Hitherto you have been occupied & engrossed with gathering together and ministering to the emigrants who all through this century have been landing upon your shores, not only in units & tens & twenties, but as it were in flights & flocks, which have in turn scattered themselves over your vast States. Your attention has also been given to the Indian & the Negro. You have not indeed compassed your aim, or wholly achieved your mission to the American Continent; but your public records & statistics prove, your

---

[2] The Mill Hill College of St. Joseph's Society had begun its work in March, 1866, and to this task Vaughan devoted his energies up to his appointment as Bishop of Salford in October, 1872. The first assignment of the Mill Hill foundation came in the fall of 1871 when they were given charge of missionary work among the American Negroes. Vaughan came to America with the four original missionaries who established themselves at St. Francis Xavier Church in Baltimore with the hearty approval of Archbishop Martin J. Spalding. Vaughan seized the opportunity to acquaint himself first-hand with the new mission field of his Society and traveled throughout the southern dioceses of the United States for about seven months. Full details of the life of Vaughan can be found in the two-volume work of J. G. Snead-Cox, *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (London, 1910).

Eminence's recent Pastoral Letter demonstrates,[3] how well you are on your way — how wonderfully God has blessed your endeavours; how zealous & enterprising have been the Bishops & the Priests; how responsive, how generous, how filled with the sentiments of faith & charity have been your people. Never, unless indeed it were in the opening of the Irish Church after the preaching of St. Patrick, has there been so rapid and exuberant a growth as that of the American Church.

And now my Lord Cardinal, in the presence and commemoration of these facts, what is the thought that emboldens me? It is covered under this question. Has not the time come for the American Church to take its share in the great Foreign Missionary work of the Church? Can you expect that the second century of your existence will be as blessed & magnificent in its religious history as your infancy has been, if you do not send forth your heroic missioners to bear the torch of faith into those dark regions which are now possessed by the enemy of man's salvation, & by over twelve hundred millions of pagans & unbelievers?

I know that some will point to the work which still has to be accomplished at home. Some will dwell upon the losses which it may be impossible to retrieve. But these considerations form no valid reason against undertaking missionary work abroad. It never has formed a solid reason against the diffusion of Apostolic zeal, since the Apostles spread themselves over the old world, leaving their own country unconverted.

The example of the Apostles was followed by the young Church in Rome, by our own Anglo-Saxon Church & others, but by none more conspicuously or more successfully than by the Church of S. Patrick in Ireland. In the second century of the Irish Church, the Irish Apostles were overrunning Europe with the light of faith & salvation. Men are too apt to imagine that faith & salvation are the result of mere human activity & devotion, & that the more we concentrate all our forces upon our own land, the more certainly shall we secure to it these blessings. Whereas in fact, faith & salvation belong to the supernatural order; they are the supernatural gifts of God, and are won by those means which especially touch the Divine Heart of Our Lord & appeal to the great Fatherhood of God over all. This thought was eloquently expressed by the late Bishop of Birmingham,[4] in a letter which he was good enough to address to me six &

---

[3] The text of Cardinal Gibbons' pastoral on the centenary may be read in "The Cardinal on the Centenary of the American Hierarchy," *American Ecclesiastical Review,* I (Nov.-Dec., 1899), 415-423. The pastoral carried a tribute to Archbishop Carroll as founder of the hierarchy and gave a review of the state of the Church of the United States in 1889. It was issued from Baltimore on October 8, 1889.

[4] William B. Ullathorne, O.S.B. (1806-1889). Ullathorne was a missionary in Australia from 1833-1840; he was named Bishop of Birmingham in 1850 and ruled that see until his resignation in 1888, a year before his death.

twenty years ago. He was answering the objections of the worldly wise & the dictates of a mere human prudence, which saw in the condition of the Church in England every kind of reason against embarking in the foreign missionary enterprise, which was then proposed. He wrote thus:

"I believe our own future will be blessed with increase in proportion as we, with earnest faith, send help to them who cry to us — as we have cried to others & received their help. I believe it, because it is the disposition of our Heavenly Father greatly to help those who do such works of faith & charity. I believe it, because there is no charity greater or more blessed, than that which co-operates with God in sending His servants forth to spread His light, & minister His grace to the nations afar off, who sit in darkness & alienation of soul from their Supreme Good. I believe it, because the mission to the Heathen is the school of generous heroes, whose works of faith & sanctity will bless the country that sends them forth. I believe it on the word of Our Blessed Lord, 'Give & it shall be given unto you again, full measure & heaped up, & overflowing into your bosom.'

"All facts show the operation of this heavenly law of charity. The great missionary nations have been the flourishing and enduring churches. And all remote history shows how generous Our Lord is of His grace to the people who are generous to the destitute souls for whom He died. I heard the substance of these remarks urged by generous Irish prelates, in the year 1836, to their young clergy, when the spirit of the foreign missions took its recent expansion in that Catholic country, & time has confirmed the truth which their faith & piety enunciated. If then, our own spiritual wants are yet so great, we shall wisely consult for them, whilst we are thinking of the greater destitution of our brethren & fellow creatures in remote lands.

"A missionary college would enrich us with a new & a great spiritual element. It would open the door to generous youths whom God calls to that special vocation. It would augment the spirit of faith & charity, & render the generous gifts of those who would repay the Church for their own conversion, efficient. The ardour of such a work would quicken & stimulate the missionary spirit at home. It would bring upon us that blessing which holy Job so greatly prized — the blessing of those who were ready to perish."

I have ventured to quote these words, whereby Bishop Ullathorne urged Foreign Missionary work upon our English Church, six & twenty years ago, when we were poorer in men & resources than we are even now, because they insist upon great supernatural truths, which cannot be too deeply engraven on our hearts. The whole of the English Hierarchy took up the doctrine contained under these words, so that in 1868 the present

Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster[5] was able, at a great public meeting in London, to define the position of the Church in England as follows:

"Under the penal laws [he said] it was enough for the Catholics of England and Ireland to stand firm. Rather than desert their homes & their kindred, they stood for the faith. This is a sufficient reason, why, in those days, they did not undertake a mission to the heathen. The times are happily altered now; and as when the Church in Rome ascended from the catacombs into the noon-day sun, at once it used the freedom of its limbs & the liberty of its speech, and penetrated everywhere — so has the Catholic Church in England begun to exercise its power and its mission, & the work for which we meet tonight is one part of that high office. It is not twenty years since the Catholic Church in England received the last perfect organisation which constituted it once more a part of the Hierarchy of the Universal Church. *And now before a generation has passed after that day, the Hierarchy of England meets together with one heart & with one will, to organize missions to the heathen.* The work of tonight [the establishment of missions to the heathen] is not tardy, neither is it too soon: but it is in time & seasonable. It is where in the order of our progress it ought to be."

Pardon these quotations, if only they provoke some among you to do, as you ought to do, better than we have done. For who are we? a mere handful compared to you. We live & work under poverty in men & resources. We are but a million & a half, mostly of the working class — you are six times our strength in numbers & more than six times our strength in resources. Your population numbers 9 millions and it is expanding with all the vigour of its youth in wealth & power.

O my Lord! what high hopes may not the Church entertain in beholding your progress at home! How she impatiently looks to the time when you will turn your eyes to the heathen & send forth your Apostles into the missionary lands abroad!

Everything seems to awaken & justify a high expectation. First, the whole of the East, from Constantinople to Jerusalem, China & Japan, & the islands of the Pacific, are at present overrun with Protestant American Missionaries. For energy, self-sacrifice, skill & intelligence, they are generally represented as outstripping the agents of all the great English Protestant missionary Societies. They surpass them through the traits of the national character; but this national character is equally yours, and a fair contribution from it is due to the Apostolic work of the Catholic Church. But more than this. Your Church must be heir to something beyond your natural & national gifts: it must be heir also to the great missionary spirit of S. Patrick. With the enterprise, therefore, the courage, skill & adaptability of the American, conjoined with the Catholic & Apostolic spirit of the Missioner — permit me to say it — your Church ought to produce a race of foreign missioners which should take the lead during the next century in the evangelisation of the heathen world.

---

[5] Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892). Manning was named Archbishop of Westminster in 1865.

Next, has not Leo XIII of late concentrated the attention of Christendom upon the redemption of Africa?[6] Is not every country in Europe seconding his efforts? Even non-Catholic Kingdoms, like England & Prussia, are animated by the thought that the time has arrived for bringing a great work of philanthropy & mercy to bear upon Africa. The dark continent is being opened up, light is being carried into it. Commerce is seeking new markets — but a noble desire to raise & enlighten that race — to destroy slavery, to establish liberty, to promote humanity holds a large place in the public conscience of Europe. Is the Catholic Church of the United States alone to remain a stranger to this movement? Impossible. It was not without a singular dispensation of Providence that millions of Africans were carried over to the States, that there they grew up under your hand, learning your manners, your habits, your civilization, your religion. The time of their pupilage is over; you have set them free & made them your equals before the law. And now Ethiopia stretches forth her hands to you. She cries to you for help, & pleads with her own flesh & blood for the blessings of freedom & salvation. It is but natural to hope & expect that the greatest triumph of Christianity in Africa should come from America, through its population of European and African descent, bound together in the cause of Christ. Upon what other nation does this duty towards Africa press with more urgent, more natural, more expectant claims than upon yours? It was a dictate either of nature or of grace, which, some 70 years ago, prompted the formation of the American Colonization Society for the regeneration of Africa.[7] And if the experiment of Liberia, which was its outcome, has failed to be the success which it might have been, this is attributable to circumstances which need never recur, at least in connection with a Catholic association formed for the conversion of Africa. I do not believe that Africa is to be won over to the Cross, by military conquest, by sporadic raiding, or even by the influence of wandering preachers & the isolated efforts of heroic men; but rather by the gradual formation of Catholic settlements & colonies in suitable localities, which may serve as centres of Christian civilization, as the monasteries of the Church did to the population of Europe, while it was still in the confusion & contest of barbarism. This solicitude, this sense of duty towards the great African race, in its connection with America, is no new thought either to your Eminence or to myself. In 1872, in a lecture delivered in New York, when explaining the work of evangelising the coloured people of America, which your illustrious predecessor, Archbishop Spalding, had invited S. Joseph's Society to take part in, I used these words: "We have come to evangelize the coloured people of America, but our mission does not terminate with them. We are travelling, through America, to that great, unexplored, unconverted continent of Africa. We have come to gather an army on the way to conquer it for the Cross. God calls upon you for co-operation. His plans are prepared from afar. The branch torn away from the parent-stem in Africa was carried to America—carried by Divine permission, in order that it might be engrafted upon the tree of the Cross. It will return in part to its own soil, not by violence or deportation, but willingly, & borne on the wings of Faith & Charity. Before many years are passed, I hope to see the members of St. Joseph's Society at work in Africa, aided, multiplied & extending their labours through the generous & loving co-operation of American coloured people, among whom will arise Catechists, Sisters & Missioners."

---

[6] Vaughan was most likely referring here to Leo XIII's letter of May 5, 1888, *In plurimis,* addressed to the hierarchy of Brazil in congratulation on the suppression of slavery in Brazil. In his letter the Pope took occasion to dwell on the evils which the slave trade had visited upon Africa.

[7] The American Colonization Society was founded in 1817 to transport free Negroes to Liberia from the United States and between 1821-1867 about 6,000 were thus brought to Africa. The American Catholic Church made an effort to establish a mission among these colored people of Liberia when Father Edward Barron of Philadelphia, Father John Kelly of New York, and a lay catechist, Dionysius Pindar, sailed in December, 1841, for Africa. The mission, however, was not successful and by mid-1844 it had been abandoned. Cf. "The Catholic Church in Liberia," by Henry P. Fisher, C.S.P., in *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, XL (1929), 249-310.

I do not dwell on this forecast, this project, except to say that it contained nothing original, nothing singular, nothing but what is within the range of possibility, within the compass of Christian humanity, within the Divine mission of the American Church. Your Eminence has already, with that broadness of view for which you are distinguished, put your hand to the beginning of the realisation of this project, by accepting & blessing the American charity, which has enabled us to open an Apostolic College in Baltimore, for the education of Missioners, of both European & African descent, to be consecrated exclusively to the conversion of the coloured race. That College is a seed planted in Catholic Maryland, which in time, under God's blessing, will stretch its branches over the coloured race of two continents, if such be the will of the American Church.

A beginning has been made. But other Colleges, other Societies, more powerful than our own, may arise in your midst; & God grant that the exuberance of your zeal may create a number of centres in the American Church, for the formation of Apostles, not only to Africa, but to other parts of the world. For although Africa is connected with the States by ties of consanguinity, the horizon of a Catholic Apostolate is not confined to ties of blood, or the boundaries of a single continent. While error is propagated by American agents throughout the Far East, the Apostles of the American Church cannot refuse to co-operate with Peter in sending forth heralds of the true Faith.

I know that some will meet these proposals with the poor excuse that much remains to be done at home — that your Negro population remains unconverted, that the aboriginal lord of the soil, the Indian, claims your care — and above all, that you cannot overtake the growing demands of your population of European descent. I answer the objection, as applied to America, in the words with which Cardinal Manning replied to it, when it was urged against us in England, now more than twenty years ago. I quote from the printed report of the Cardinal's speech: "It is quite true we have need of men & of means at home: and it is *because* we have need of men & of means at home and of more men & of more means by a great deal than we as yet possess, that I am convinced that we ought to send both men & means abroad. (Applause.) It is because I believe that in enriching others we shall impoverish ourselves, that I, therefore, believe it to be our duty; and I believe it to be strictly in accordance with the letter & the spirit of Our Master's example, of Whom it is said: 'Who though He was rich, yet, for our sakes, He became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich.' (Applause.) I am entirely convinced that if we desire to find the surest way to multiply immensely our own material means in this country for our works at home, it is by not limiting the expansion of Charity, & by not paralysing the zeal of self-denial. Holy Scripture teaches us that there are those who give and are yet enriched, & there are those who withhold from giving and are always in want. I believe that this applies most strictly to the present case. We have the promise, 'Give & it shall be given unto you'; 'freely you have received, freely give'; not calculating whether that which we give will impoverish, but trusting in the Giver of all good gifts, that if we use rightly that which He has bestowed upon us, He will abundantly multiply our substance." (Applause.)

I need add no words to these noble expressions of enlightened faith & charity, which will find a ready response wherever they may be read by the Catholics of America.

Finally, my Lord Cardinal, let me bold to urge one consideration, as my own apology for addressing you upon this subject, viz., that the future of the world is with the English-speaking race. According to all calculations, its language, its wealth, its energy & influence, its civilization, & therefore its religion, will become dominant, at least beyond the boundaries of the old Continent of Europe. This consideration justifies any Bishop belonging to the English-speaking race, in raising his voice, however feeble, and crying out to his brethren, to consider well the part which their race has to play in the future of Christendom; to prepare betimes; to stir up the Apostolic spirit; to enlarge the hearts of the people; to found Foreign Missionary Societies & Colleges; and in a word, to develop the organizations & resources which the Church must look to for the conversion of the unevangelized world. The emissaries of error are not asleep; they are already busy in the fields which it is the mission of the Church to win to Jesus Christ. Surely, then, we ought to rise to the level of our privilege & our calling, & to be forward in taking possession of the ground. The Holy See looks to the vigorous English-speaking nations to make up for defections at home, by helping Blessed Peter to press more zealously than ever into the great unconverted countries of the world. Here, then, is our common interest, our common mission, binding us together by another bond of love, in our Master's service.

And now, my Lord Cardinal, while you & your colleagues are celebrating the centenary of your Church & worthily marking the epoch by the erection of a Catholic University, would it not be possible to give expression to some determination on the part of the Catholics of America, to participate to the full in the sufferings & martyrdoms, the triumphs & conquests of the Church's Apostolate throughout the world, during the second centenary of the American Episcopate?

I have the honour to be, my dear Lord Cardinal,

Your Eminence's faithful & devoted servant,

✠ HERBERT, BISHOP OF SALFORD.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Paul of Tarsus. By Joseph Holzner. Translated by Frederic C. Eckhoff. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1944. Pp. vi, 502. $5.00.)

This book, which has been so admirably translated, is a welcome antidote to the incompetent and biased study of the Apostle of the Gentiles published by Scholem Asch. The author has a thorough grasp of the sources, based on the best and most scientific commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul. His knowledge is coupled with a gift for literary presentation. In consequence, we have a portrait of St. Paul which is trustworthy, captivating, and inspiring. Erudition abounds, but we never feel its burden; it is always used judiciously and unobtrusively to illuminate the character and activity of the great apostle.

A remarkable feature of the work is the author's intimate acquaintance with the historical, archaeological, and geographical details connected with his subject. This lends a vivid air of reality to his description of St. Paul's travels and enables us to appreciate his difficulties and triumphs in the great centers where he preached, such as Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome. No important discovery of modern research has been overlooked; all have been pieced together with loving and discriminating care to throw the lineaments of St. Paul into striking relief.

The reader will be particularly pleased with the exposition of St. Paul's Epistles. The author proposes an explanatory paraphrase which provides us with an adequate insight into the meaning of the apostle. In the reviewer's estimation the chapters on the Thessalonians, Corinthians, and Philemon merit particular praise. It is regrettable that the author did not treat the Epistle to the Hebrews. We hope that this excellent book will be widely diffused to counteract the hatred which certain circles endeavor to arouse against the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Michael J. Gruenthaner

The Catholic University of America

Mater Ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity. By Joseph C. Plumpe, Assistant Professor of Latin in the Catholic University of America. [The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, No. 5.] (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1943. Pp. xxi, 149. $2.00.)

In a paper entitled, "Ecclesia Mater," published in 1939 (*Transactions of the American Philological Association,* LXX, 535-555), the author indicated that the Church is often referred to as a mother as early as Tertullian and St. Cyprian, and he raised the question whether the concept and term might possibly be found earlier in Christian Greek writers or documents. The monograph under review, embodying the results of his preliminary and later researches, is a systematic and exhaustive investigation of the concept of the Church as mother in East and West to the death of St. Methodius of Philippi (311 A.D.).

The chapter headings will give a concrete idea of the content and scope of the work: I Scriptural Prototypes and Contemporary Pagan-Gnostic Analogies; II. Christian Anticipations of the **ΜΗΤΗΡ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ** during the Second Century; III. The Earliest Evidence of the Word **ΜΗΤΗΡ** Used as a Title for the Church: the Confessors of Lyons and Vienne; St. Irenaeus; IV. The *Mater Ecclesia* of Tertullian; V. The **ΜΗΤΗΡ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ** of Clement and Origen; VI. St. Cyprian's Appeal to the *Mater Ecclesia;* VII. **ΜΗΤΗΡ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ** in the Mysticism of St. Methodius of Philippi; VIII. Retrospect. Rome's Silence.

All available sources — pagan and Christian literature, inscriptions, papyri, archaeological monuments—have been utilized and interpreted with the necessary philological and theological competence. The author shows also a complete control of the widely-scattered modern literature bearing in any way upon his subject. The main conclusions are: the earliest extant reference to the Church as a mother appears in a Christian Greek document, the *Epistola Ecclesiarum Viennensis et Lugdunensis,* written in 177 or 178 A.D. by men who obviously were in close relations with the Greek Christian communities of Asia Minor; the concept of the *Mater Ecclesia* appears as already familiar and fully developed in the works of Tertullian and especially St. Cyprian; the usage of Methodius of Philippi shows striking affinities with that of the Gallic *Epistola* mentioned above; Phrygia in Asia Minor was most probably the place of origin of the concept of **Μήτηρ 'Εκκλησία** and the time of origin should be fixed at about the middle of the second century A.D. — although there is a possibility that the concept may have passed into Asia Minor from Antioch about the middle of the second century; finally, there is no trace of the term at Rome before Pope Damasus I (366-384).

The present monograph, both in content and method, is a contribution of considerable importance. While some work had been done before the author's preliminary paper of 1939, this is the first systematic and exhaustive treatment of the subject. The conclusions, startling as they may seem, do not go beyond the evidence of the sources. On the contrary, they could in part have been stated with even greater confidence. The study exhibits an exemplary use of the historical and comparative method of investigating the ideas and practices of the early Church as this method has been developed by the late F. J. Dölger and his pupils — among them Professor Johannes Quasten, editor of the series in which Father Plumpe's monograph appears. A thorough analysis of the evidence from every possible point of view has again shown that, while there are essential differences between many pagan and Judaeo-Christian concepts, the ideas of a given pagan milieu were undoubtedly an important factor in the focusing of attention upon and in the further development of related or parallel Christian ideas. It is extremely difficult to grasp the full and precise meaning of ancient terminology in almost any field. Therefore, investigations of important ancient terms and concepts, whether pagan or Christian, should be regarded as among the most necessary and fruitful types of philological research at the present time. Competent studies of this kind, however, demand a scholarly breadth and training which few possess.

The following minor criticisms or suggestions are offered. Page xvii, line 15: for *Religionem* read *Religionen*. Page 2, line 9 ff.: the text of the *Septuagint* is quoted, but the English translation given corresponds not to the Septuagint but to the somewhat different reading of the Latin Vulgate. Page 6 ff.: the author might have emphasized, it seems to the reviewer, that while St. Paul had the Old Testament tradition in mind in Gal. 4, 26, it is precisely here that he speaks of Jerusalem as our mother, i.e., makes use of a terminology which reflects Hebrew tradition but at the same time would be particularly intelligible to a people devoted to the cult of the Great Mother. Pages 51-52: Since the meaning of *apud* in Tertullian, *De Bapt.* 20, is so important, references might have been made to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and particularly to A. Gagnér, "Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition Apud," *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift,* 1931, 3. Page 118, note 20: Before making a final decision on the meaning of *μετά* here, it would be well to consider also the evidence of the papyri. Page 125: In connection with the spread of Montanism from Phrygia to Africa it might be observed in passing that the cultural relations between Africa and the Greek world under the early Empire were probably much closer than we realize. The Asianic style, so conspicuous in African writers from Apuleius on, also came to Africa from the Greek East.

The monograph is furnished with four *indices locorum,* a copious general index, a valuable bibliography, and four well-finished plates.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

Protestantism. A Symposium. Edited by WILLIAM K. ANDERSON. (Nashville, Tennessee: Commission on Courses of Study. The Methodist Church. 1944. Pp. vi, 282. $2.00.)

Twenty-six writers, representing several denominations, attempt here to survey the phenomena of Protestantism from its inception to the present day. They do not speak for all Protestants, for several groups are not represented. These essays accordingly do not present a consistent whole, and so it probably would be unfair to call attention to contradictions between them. But there are discrepancies in the statements of individual authors. Thus, while the "supreme authority" for Protestantism by one of them is declared to be found in Scripture, there is said to exist no "purely external authentication of truth," for the "Bible or the Church cannot by its divinely inspired authority make a proposition true." One wonders whether the Divine Master, whose words are preserved in the Gospels, spoke with authority. Acceptance of such authority is no longer possible, it is declared, due to modern epistemology which is extremely — and perhaps all too facilely — sceptical of our ability to arrive at final truth.

Ten of the essays, grouped under "History," cover a vast field. One of the unfortunate aspects of the study of religious history is our difficulty to view an historic situation from the inside. Few people outside the ancient Church pay attention to the inner spirituality which was so marked a feature of Catholic life. It seems impossible to ascribe the Catholic Reform essentially, as one of the contributors does, to the rise of Protestantism and not to the persisting religious life of the Church, which ultimately burst forth with great energy, thus beginning to create conditions favorable for a reformation even before Luther nailed up his theses. Certainly the spectacle of a wide revolt contributed its part in stimulating reform, as we learn from St. Teresa of Avila; but the reviewer can see little organic connection between the phenomena of Protestantism and the many evidences of Catholic Reform from the day of Isabella of Castile to St. Francis of Sales.

The question of the origins of Protestantism is a difficult one. To seek it in the opposition to the Church in mediaeval times would be correct only, it appears, if opposition to Catholic Christianity is to be regarded as the chief feature of Protestantism. To declare that the Cathari were "Protestants before Luther" muddles the understanding, for the Cathari rejected the Old Testament and also the nature of Christ as taught by Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and other Protestants.

The next nine essays under the heading "Interpretations" cover many topics. The best of these is the one on "Protestantism and Music." The article on "Ethics" has sensible observations on the subject of casuistry. The remaining six topics under "Opportunities" most readers will probably find least instructive.

In general, the authors aim to be objective, and although readers will find instructive passages, some statements cannot pass unchallenged. Among them are the following opinions: the *"Imitation of Christ* is the sterile residue of a once-mighty teaching and preaching order;" the mediaeval Church was a "totalitarian superstate;" Jesus was "non-ascetic;" "Romanism" has been "distrustful of personal religious experience;" "the Roman Catholic is, after all, only mildly interested in the Bible;" the Mass "degenerated into a sterile formalism until the *hoc est corpus* of the Mass has become the hocus pocus of the scoffer;" a Catholic who "accepts the Church as his guide and shows that he sincerely intends to obey that guide, can then do about what he pleases;" and "Roman Catholicism considers holiness as the possibility of only a few."

These we recognize as stereotyped criticisms of the historical labors of the Church, and they should not disturb us. The chapter on Latin Christianity, as an objective statement, does not inspire confidence, for its sweeping denunciations run counter to our experience with Latin American Christians. One writer objects to Catholic education because the Catholic minority "continues to educate its children in authoritarian modes of thought and action." Another, discussing the problems confronting Protestant churches, names "the Roman Catholic problem" along with such matters as secularism and political relations. And, finally, one writer who disapproves of the principle of celibacy asserts that at the "top of the structure (i.e. the Catholic Church) there is an abnormality that blights." He states that "Protestantism has steadily refused to invade the sanctity of the marriage vow for the interests of the Church." Does this mean that invading the sanctity of the marriage vow was for the interests of Protestantism, but in spite of such interests Protestantism has steadily refused to do so? Christ Himself lived celibately; but we never heard of any person so bold as to suggest that His example was a blighting abnormality.

HENRY S. LUCAS
University of Washington

Carmelite and Poet. A Framed Portrait of St. John of the Cross with His Poems in Spanish. By ROBERT SENCOURT. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. x, 278. $3.00.)

Those who would seek relief from the world's present gloom in a more heartening chapter of history, would do well to turn to Mr. Sencourt's latest book. It tells the thrilling story of Fray Juan de la Cruz — known to us as St. John of the Cross — the coadjutor of St. Teresa of Avila, the partner in her tribulations, the supreme mystical doctor of the Church and, besides all that, the greatest lyrical poet of Spain. Only a critic of Mr. Sencourt's penetrating vision and long and intimate familiarity with

Spanish history, life, and character, and particularly with Spanish mystics, could have given us so true and integrated a picture of the flaming spirit who blazed across sixteenth-century Spain but left behind him an enduring glow to revive and rekindle timid souls in less courageous times.

As the sub-title of the book — A Framed Portrait — suggests, Mr. Sencourt presents St. John not as an isolated figure hidden in mystic heights, but as one in full contact with all the national, social, cultural, and spiritual influences that played upon his life, and as one responsive to the demands of times, places, and persons. In so doing, the author has thrown open to our view a throng of contemporary personages in Church, State, and society, and thereby a whole phase of Spanish history. For across the Spanish scene so vividly painted move St. John's celebrated teacher Luis de Leon, the first Jesuits, noted theologians, apostolic visitors and nuncios, the king and members of the gentry, and, of course, Carmelite nuns and priors with St. Teresa and St. John in the forefront, both laboring to carry through a project of reform in an atmosphere of intrigue and in the teeth of positive persecution.

The outstanding merit of Mr. Sencourt's work is, in this reviewer's judgment, that it brings St. John of the Cross close to earth, makes him intelligible to men of good will and invites closer acquaintance with a genius of sanctity who deserves to be better known. Too many good people, for want of competent guides, have for too long a time regarded St. John of the Cross as a severe, sombre spirit perched too far up on the summits of spirituality to approach or to understand. And yet, as Mr. Sencourt reveals him in the informative chapters that analyze the mystical philosophy of the saint's *Ascent of Mount Carmel, The Dark Night of the Soul, The Song of the Spirit,* and *The Living Flame of Love,* John of the Cross was a very human person, completely abandoned to God, indeed, and clinging to the cross, but in touch with reality withal, always moving on the level of common sense, a keen lover of art, beauty, and nature, while at the same time gifted with "an inward eye which saw in the suspension of the lower faculties such glories in the heavens as night discloses through the darkness when the stars shine out to tell a story denied to the gaudy day." This was St. John's "dark night of the soul" which nevertheless filled his soul with overpowering love and gave it tongue in those exquisite and incomparable lyrics which make him the poet of the soul *par excellence,* and with which Mr. Sencourt gives his book a fit and graceful ending.

DEMETRIUS B. ZEMA

Fordham University

Alfred Loisy. His Religious Significance. By M. D. PETRE. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1944. Pp. xi, 129. $1.65.)

The title of this book, printed in large, bold letters on the publisher's wrapper, is quite enough to stir the curiosity of those who are familiar with the now dead movement once called Catholic modernism. But it is really the sub-title, 'His Religious Significance,' that furnishes the *raison d'être* of the volume, for it makes no pretense to being a biography of Alfred Loisy.

To be in a position to evaluate Loisy's religious significance, it is necessary, of course, to have in perspective the character of his religious teaching. Miss Petre was obviously certain that Loisy was a deeply religious man. The only proof she offers is the fact that all his writings center about religion. There is an element of truth in this, if by religion we mean merely the subjective stirrings of the soul — what Loisy and others came to call the religious sense. All his writings, both during and after the modernist quarrel, might be called an apology for the validity of religious experience in the subject apart from any objective reality in which this experience might be grounded. He himself states in his *Mémoires* (I, 453) that the analysis he made in his *Livre Inédit* of the purpose of religious thought and activity, implied the negation of all supernatural agencies (*mécanisme*). And this was his attitude towards religion many years before he said his last Mass in 1908. For him the essence of all religion, the one and only worthwhile thing about it, was the awareness of the eternal striving of the soul upwards towards some sort of union with an unknown and unknowable being called God or the Absolute. But there are rather few living today who will be satisfied with such a definition of religion.

It is possible to speak of two stages in the development of Loisy's religious thought; three, if we are to count the period of his thoroughly Catholic belief from which at an ill-defined time he departed. But Miss Petre cannot possibly refer to this period of traditional orthodoxy; otherwise her book with its sub-title could have had no reason for its existence. A thing has special significance not in virtue of what it has in common with many others, but only in so far as it differs from all these. Loisy had ceased to be a Catholic in thought long before he left the Catholic Church and his priesthood. This is evident to anyone who has read his *Mémoires.* That he was sincere in thinking that his religious views were still compatible with Catholicism, may be difficult to believe, but whether he was or not, the facts speak for themselves. He was no more a Catholic in the traditional sense of that word than would be a religious-minded Protestant, Jew, Mohammedan, Hindu, or for that matter, a follower of no organized church whatever. In 1906, more than two years before he said his last Mass, he admitted as much himself. On September 27 of that year he posted in his diary these words: "My attitude appears to me more and more to be a complete farce (pure comédie). When a person entertains such ideas as I do he is no longer a Catholic" (I, 485). And he did entertain such ideas at least as far back as 1893. Whatever be the real date of his break with traditional Catholicism, that date heralds the beginning of Loisy's religious thought in so far as it interests Miss Petre and to the extent in which she believed he has a religious significance or a religious message for time to come.

It is in this period that one might speak of two stages, divided one from the other not so much by any marked difference in his ideas as by an external fact — the suppression of modernism within the Church by the energetic action of Pope Pius X. In both stages his one concern is with biblical criticism and the religious value of the Bible and early church history. For many years he hoped to prove that Catholic teaching had value in so far, but in so far only, as its dogmas represented not facts of history but the religious experience of the individual, and particularly of the human race. This in brief was the very essence of the modernist movement within the Catholic Church. For Loisy this period of his life came to an end when modernism died a quick death. But his thought carried on without any substantial change. Whatever little difference there may be might well be described in the words of Miss Petre: "When Loisy ceased to be a Catholic he ceased likewise to be a Modernist" (p. 57). Or perhaps better still in the words of Loisy himself: "Whereas before I worked for humanity in the Church, now I labored simply for humanity" (III, 549). Henceforth Loisy's religion resolves itself into a cult of or devotion to or faith in humanity, which in its constant struggle towards goodness and justice reveals in itself various phases or aspects of the unknown and unknowable Absolute.

This is what Miss Petre's book leads up to through eleven chapters, all of which borrow largely from Loisy's *Mémoires*. According to Miss Petre, Loisys's religious significance consists in three things. There is first of all his conception of the New Testament literature as catechetical and not historical in character. This is, of course, undisguised modernism, and modernism never had any religious significance of its own. In the second place, there is his repudiation of all artificial myth-making. By this Miss Petre means that Loisy had no patience with any other myths apart from the essential myth of Christianity. Myth though it be in its traditional dogmas, Loisy insisted that it was not an artificial myth because it represented the essential striving of the soul upwards. For this ignoble contribution Miss Petre expects the world to be grateful to Loisy. Finally, there is his belief in the historical existence of Christ, even though he denied to Him every claim to real divinity. This would sound rather silly, did it not reveal such depths of tragedy.

That Loisy's conception of Catholicity and Christianity could ever prove to be a genuine apology, as Miss Petre contends, that religion itself could long endure in the hearts of men without the conviction that its beliefs were not mere expressions of noble feelings and aspirations but rather the products of an objective revelation, of a divine message, that Christ could remain for the ages to come the center of man's mind and heart without remaining at the same time the real and eternal Son of God made Man — all this is not religion, but sheerest chimera. Since these are the sum total of Loisy's contribution to religious thought, according to even his most devoted apologist, there is only one conclusion to which we can honestly come, and it is this: Loisy simply has no religious significance, and Miss Petre's book is rather much ado about nothing.

Louis A. Arand

The Catholic University of America

The Listening Post. Eighteen Years on Vatican Hill. By Thomas B. Morgan. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1944. Pp. v, 242. $3.00.)

This book contains, among other things, the story of Vatican diplomacy during the last generation, and it is for that reason that it will now be chiefly read, when people wish to be informed as to the relations of the Vatican to Hitlers and Mussolinis. Indeed, it merits being read for this story, for where else is it told in so few words with such freshness and fairness?

At the same time it ought to be remarked that the volume contains something else, which may give it more permanent importance. It contains the story of the story-teller. Both as a saga and a record of the actions of the Vatican from the time of Cardinal Consalvi to that of Cardinal Maglione, the book will be superseded, for though few historians will write with more freshness, they have more fullness of detail, and hence more comprehension. But nobody shall ever tell the experiences of Thomas B. Morgan at the Vatican from 1921 to 1938 better than he. They are his.

And yet they are for us; they are world news. It is something to think twice about that an American reporter — for that is Morgan's profession — a Protestant from Steubenville, Ohio, who was snow-balled by the boys of the parochial school in his youth, should have been able to write with such comprehension of the Vatican, even with eighteen years of residence at Rome. There have been times when outsiders at Rome — and not merely Protestant outsiders — could not make head or tail of what the Vatican was about. The Romans delight in telling stories they scarcely believe, and the outsiders believe them. Yet Morgan saw clear. Partly this is Morgan's personal intelligence and perspicacity. He had sense enough to study the past, even though he was responsible for covering only the latest news. He could discern the reliability of this or that informant. Partly, too, it was due to his newspaper-man's code. He was ordered to be objective. Competition with other reporters forced him to be objective. But also it was due to the happy relation which the Vatican maintains with reporters.

This is something to study, and in this book it can be studied. It will be observed that the Vatican has no new-fangled, brilliantly-contrived, system of publicity to make its mind known, or to conceal its mind. The Vatican goes on its course, yet does not scold the reporters out of its way. It grants to them some of the privileges of angels or court fools. In other words, they are trusted. No questions are asked. They are expected to be objective.

Certainly the American reporter, Morgan, was allowed within certain limits, to go about. He met great prelates, minor prelates, and more or less venal Vatican messengers. He tells of this with utter frankness. He understands what goes on, because he has seen a Cardinal Merry del Val, and a Gasparri, even when they were not looking at him. He knows the corridors of the Secretaries of State. He is allowed to be present like a God-made mouse or a mosquito, and sometimes he is accorded such privileges as sitting with the then Cardinal Pacelli at Cività Vecchia and watching the sun go down, and conversing with him.

As a result, Morgan is enabled to see. He sees through the pomp and ceremony of Vatican decorum to the essential simplicity of the Vatican's mission. This is a part of the story of the modern world.

DANIEL SARGENT

South Natick, Massachusetts

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

School and Church: The American Way. An Historical Approach to the Problem of Religious Instruction in Public Education. By CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN, Professor of the History of Christianity in Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1944. Pp. x, 178. $2.50.)

"Religion is indestructible because it originates on the borderline between the known and the unknown. It will survive as long as mystery endures." That is one of the many *ex cathedra* pronouncements made by Professor Moehlmann in his latest work in which he tackles the problem of religious instruction in public, tax-supported schools. Dr. Moehlman writes excellently when he sketches the development of public education in the United States. He marshals his facts well and digs up a fund of historical data invaluable to the worker in the field of educational history. But when he interprets his facts, he indulges in theological and scriptural speculations that lack both matter and form and that too easily transport one into an atmosphere of vanishing zeros and cosmic confusions.

Of a truth, the book ought to be in the hands of every Protestant minister in the United States; it ought to be circulated among the educated Protestant laity just to prove to them how easily certain types of accepted scholarship, emanating from the academic freedom guaranteed by heavily-endowed universities and colleges, evaporate into airy nothingness. And it ought to be read by every Catholic priest interested in education, by every Catholic in any way occupied with education, and by every sincere Catholic parent, for it is by far the best defense (not consciously so) of the Catholic position on "the Catholic School for the Catholic Child" that has come to this reviewer's notice from a non-Catholic authority on education.

Professor Moehlman will have no truck with those Protestants who would have religion put back into the public schools. He analyzes and sifts carefully every argument advanced by the proponents of the released time, bible-study, ethical-teaching theories. And he pulverizes them to his heart's content in his best academic manner. Although "public education is the child of American Protestantism . . . . the child has grown to maturity and can no longer accept Protestant mothering. The general confusion, especially in Protestant circles, concerning the function of public education in a democracy, results from lack of historical perspective." He then reconstructs that perspective according to his own blueprints, and in so doing he demolishes the whole structure of traditional Protestantism by blistering applications of his 'historical method.'

He writes eloquently on the "Fundamental Surrenders of the Protestant Age." "It was between 1607 and 1791, when Protestantism was in the saddle, that the three great powers were surrendered to the state: (1) marriage laws and regulations; (2) the control of wealth; and (3) the control of education." It looks today as if these three surrenders are the wild roots from which stem the horrors of war, rebellion, and revolution. It was on these three subjects, marriage, wealth and education that Pope Pius XI spoke no strange language in the now classic encyclicals: *On Christian Marriage* (1930), *On Reconstructing the Social Order* (1931), and *On the Christian Education of Youth* (1929), the encyclicals in which the axe was ruthlessly laid to the roots of the historical method used by modernists in dealing with the principles of the fundamental human relations covered by the fourth, sixth, and seventh commandments of God.

Chapter VIII is taken up with the discussion of the question, "Can the Bible Return to the Classroom?" The author's answer is a thundering "No." He proves conclusively that modern biblical interpretations among the various Protestant denominations lead to confusion far worse than the confusion of Babel.

Professor Moehlman is scathing in his indictment of the failure of modern pulpit teaching in the Protestant churches:

> The progressive theological school of today through its courses upon the Bible introduces its students to an historical conception of the Bible. But this interpretation of the Bible is in conflict with the traditional Christian mood toward an understanding of the Bible, and is still *terra incognita* to the bulk of the membership in most of the Protestant denominations in America. Because the minister soon discovers the true situation, his earlier enthusiasm for historical study gradually evaporates and he attempts to escape from his predicament by neglecting or abandoning his student point of view, at the most using the verses of the Bible only as points of departure and permitting his constituency to remain in blissful ignorance of reëvaluations that might have for them the "expulsive power of a new affection." Gradually the youth of the churches under the influence of the modern environment finds it impossible to harmonize its extra-church convictions with what it hears in Sunday school and church, and drifts away from Christian moorings until the restless and discouraged churches of today result. (p. 109).

One would judge from the temper and tone of the author's writing that it is just these "restless and discouraged churches of today" that would force the teaching of religion into tax-supported schools so that the schools would do for Christian civilization what the "restless and discouraged churches" can no longer do.

There are excellent bibliographical notes and an adequate index.

JOSEPH L. O'BRIEN

Bishop England High School
Charleston, South Carolina

Austrian Aid to American Catholics, 1830-1860. By BENJAMIN J. BLIED. (Milwaukee: By the Author. 1944. Pp. 205. $2.50.)

The abundance of materials for American church history reposing in the published reports and in the archival collections of the mission aid societies of France, Germany, and Austria long remained unexploited by American historians. During the past quarter century, however, a few scholars, notably Edward J. Hickey and Theodore Roemer, have directed their researches to these sources and enriched thereby the historiography of the American Church through their published works. Dr. Blied's volume, prepared as a doctoral dissertation at Marquette University, essays to examine the effects on the Church in the United States between 1830 and 1860 of the missionary activity set afoot in Austria at the close of the third decade of the last century by the organization of the Leopoldinen-Stiftung.

Since the number of Austrians immigrating to the United States remained insignificant during the three decades covered by this study, the volume contains little relating to any specific ministry to Austrians in this country. The account is rather one of the efforts made by clerics, religious, and laity of Austrian nationality to assist the propagation of the faith in the New World. This assistance took two chief forms — financial contributions and the personal offerings by priests and religious of their life and labor to the American missions. Of the relative importance of the two, the reader cannot fail to be of one mind with the author that "the most substantial contribution of Austria to the American missions was the number of priests which she sent and supported" (p. 8). The bulk of the volume is taken up with the presentation of the evidence supporting this conclusion. This evidence in turn takes the form of an exposition of the labors of these Austrian priests on the Indian missions and among the German immigrants. One is struck by the generosity with which the officials of the Leopoldine Foundation contributed to the support of the Indian missions during the first decade and a half of the society's existence. But by the middle 'forties the spiritual plight of the German immigrants had superseded the Indian missions as the paramount concern of the society.

Honored and distinguished names pass before the reader in this story of Austrian zeal — John N. Neumann, Frederick Baraga, Joseph Melcher, John Mosetizh, Francis X. Obermueller, Francis Pabisch, Joseph Lutz, Adelbert Inama, Francis X. Weninger, Ignatius Mrak, Francis Pierz, Joseph Salzmann, John S. Raffeiner —to mention only the most prominent. The activities of those religious communities that supplied Austrian members to the American missions or whose American foundations were aided by priests of Austrian nationality are treated at length, particularly the Redemptorists, the Jesuits, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame.

The author evinces throughout the volume an admirable open-mindedness in discussing the national rivalries present at that time within the American Catholic body. In a few instances, however, he leans in the direction of over-statement. If the assertion that "the humble immigrants, who might have been ignored, as a matter of fact laid the foundation of the Church in America, both in the populous cities of the Atlantic seaboard and on the lush plains of the Middle West" (pp. 55-56), refers exclusively, as the context seems clearly to imply, to the German immigrants, it is definitely an exaggeration. To refer without qualification to the schools opened by the religious communities of women who came to the United States from German-speaking lands as "the foundation of the American Catholic system of education" (p. 183) is less than accurate. Again, it is hard to understand on what grounds the author could justify the quoted designation of the Church of the Most Holy Redeemer, in New York City, the cornerstone of which was laid only in 1844, as "the unofficial mother church of the Germans in America" (p. 155). The baptism recorded could not have taken place in "St. Anna Church," New York City, in 1816 (p. 153, n 6). No church of that title existed in the city at that time or for a third of a century afterwards.

At times, particularly in the chapter treating of the Austrian contributions to American Catholic institutions, the conclusions rest largely upon inferential rather than direct evidence, but this must be ascribed to the general and non-specific nature of the accounts available in the *Berichte,* rather than to any lack of diligence on the part of the author. If he could have had access to the vanished archives of the Leopoldine Foundation he would probably have been able to develop with greater detail this phase of the Austrian contribution to the American Church.

The bibliography is well done in form and is reasonably complete in content for the German-speaking ministry in the Middle West. A more extended search would have been rewarded by a considerable accession to the literature of the same ministry in the eastern states. The now rare *Schematismus* of 1869 should be listed with fuller bibliographical details. The index is weak in its listing of American place names.

THOMAS F. O'CONNOR

Chancery Office
New York City

Catholic Pittsburgh's One Hundred Years. Edited by WILLIAM J. PURCELL and Committee. (Chicago: Loyola University Press. 1943. Pp. xvi, 271. $2.50.)

The opening sentence of the preface of this volume acquaints the reader with the fact that *Catholic Pittsburgh's One Hundred Years,* prepared by the Catholic Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, is not a history of the Diocese of Pittsburgh. Written without footnotes, it is a symposium of twenty-three historical essays divided into two parts. Part I, after treating of "Early Catholicity In Western Pennsylvania," contains six essays on the bishops who have ruled the Pittsburgh jurisdiction since its erection in 1843. Having different authors, the essays are naturally not of equal worth. The first, "Early Catholicity In Western Pennsylvania" by Father Felix Fellner O.S.B. is, in the reviewer's opinion, the best of Part I, although the author did not include the interesting story of Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick's determined campaign at the Fourth and Fifth Provincial Councils of Baltimore in 1840 and 1843, to have Father Michael O'Connor named the first Bishop of Pittsburgh.

On the whole the essays treating of the bishops and their administrations are, from the viewpoint of an historian, poorly done. Most of these biographical accounts contain little more than could be found in Clarke, Shea, and other secondary sources on the American hierarchy. A happy exception is "Bishop Michael Domenec and Bishop John Tuigg, 1860-1869," by John Canova. By including sufficient secular history, such as the emphasis on the financial panic following the Civil War (p. 47), Father Canova avoided the weakness common to the other essays which seem to place the bishops and their administrations in an ecclesiastical vacuum. Father Canova further strengthened his essay by not failing to mention some of the internal difficulties and financial problems the subjects of his essay had to face. While no one should expect in a volume of this type a full and complete treatment of all the internal difficulties confronting the Pittsburgh bishops in their administrations, still this point is so completely glossed over in the remainder of the biographical essays that the reader is led to believe the rule of these bishops was simply a march of continued, blissful progress. This is not only historically inaccurate, but it is unfair to these prelates who had to solve many internal problems — to name but one, that of nationalism.

The affirmed purpose of Part II is to tell the story of the growth of the Diocese of Pittsburgh. "Significant movements, indicative of the efforts of clergy and laity to advance the cause of the Church, are traced and manifestations are noted." As is the case in the growth of most of our larger dioceses, Pittsburgh's progress was in large measure the result of immigration. When the full story of the great expansion of the Pittsburgh diocese in its first century is told, immigration statistics, which are missing in this volume, will have to be included. The reader also misses an indication of at least the nationality of the foreign-born priests who devoted their lives to the Church in Pittsburgh. Their story is too heroic to be omitted.

Aided by a master's thesis on a similar subject, Father Thomas J. Quigley, superintendent of schools, has written well on "The School System In the Diocese." "Higher Education," "The Religious Communities In the Diocese," "The Holy Name Society," and various other lay movements are also treated in the second section of the work. Considering that these topics were in all limited to slightly over a hundred pages, they are fairly well done. They could have been much better done had the editors been careful to eliminate the repetitions marring many of the accounts *e.g.,* the facts of the erection of St. Paul's Church, which later became the first cathedral, are told in three different places (pp. 85, 94, and 188).

In Part II more original sources were used than in the previous section. However, even in the second section, secondary sources were leaned on too heavily with the result that there is an excessive number of errors some of which are egregious, *e.g.,* in regard to the date of the erection of the diocese — August 15, 1843 (p. 25) and August 7, 1843 (p. 94), neither of which is correct. The bull *Universi dominici* erecting the diocese bore the date of August 11, 1843 (Shearer, *Pontificia Americana,* p. 217.) The bibliography is slight. Many of the publications of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, which would have afforded secular background for this work are missing from the list of the published sources. The reviewer is surprised to learn that the archives of the metropolitan and mother see of Philadelphia are not listed among the unpublished sources.

It is no doubt true that the essayists, many of whom hold official positions, did not have sufficient time for the research necessary to write a definitive diocesan history, but a diocese a century old and of Pittsburgh's importance is worthy of a history. As was stated in the preface "the best hope of the compilers of this volume is that their work will give stimulus to some historian of the future to write the history of the diocese." When such a work is undertaken this volume, allowing for its numerous flaws, will prove valuable to the diocesan historian, for it contains in one volume most of the significant facts and, since it stands alone in the period, it is of real importance for the twentieth century. The note, "Corrected by the Chancery to July 15, 1943," should add to the reliability of the forty-seven pages of diocesan statistics reprinted in the volume from the *Official Catholic Directory*. In a volume for such general circulation as this, possibly the list of unassigned priests could have been omitted without great detriment.

HUGH J. NOLAN

St. James High School
Chester, Pennsylvania

Orestes Brownson. Yankee, Radical, Catholic. By THEODORE MAYNARD. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. xvi, 456. $3.00.)

No biographer — and I am sure that Mr. Theodore Maynard would lay modest claim to that distinction — would go to the trouble of collating and interpreting a mass of material on any particular man unless he were certain of a need for a new study of the subject. In the first pages of his volume, Mr. Maynard offers his reason for adding to the slowly increasing bibliography of that illustrious convert. He considers Arthur M. Schlesinger's *Orestes A. Brownson* (Boston, 1939), "eminently satisfactory" up to the year of his conversion to the Catholic Church. Subsequent to that period, he is sketchy and incomplete. Doran Whalen, in *Granite for God's House* (New York, 1941), fails in the same respect. Mr. Maynard admits that the true proportions are preserved by Henry F. Brownson in his three-volume life of his father, a work which although complete and in the main accurate, lacks objectivity and impartiality. To overcome these deficiencies and to portray, in a single, balanced volume, the life of a man who might almost be said to have written *de omni re scribili,* is the gigantic task of Mr. Maynard.

Does he accomplish his purpose? He certainly gives a more proportionate account than any of his "single volume" predecessors. He has woven together in a very interesting and absorbing fashion the tangled skeins of a multitudinous and diversified life. He leaves no doubt in the mind of his reader that Brownson was a sincere, honest, hard-hitting, well-read controversialist who could hold his own in both the practical and speculative fields of human activity. He also makes it equally clear that Brownson was a fractious, contentious, and argumentative individual who loved to balance and evaluate ideas with tremendous enthusiasm and energy.

Much has been said about Maynard's volume in previous reviews and the reviewer does not intend to trespass on that same ground. There is no need for one here to describe the book, nor to summarize it. An attempt will be made to critically evaluate it from the point of view of the historian. The reviewer might also add that he has no intention of pointing to trivial points of difference, nor to enumerate slight errors here or there.

The general impression received from Mr. Maynard's volume is that he approaches his subject more as a litterateur than as a historian. He is not careful in the handling of his material, not too judicious in the selection of his sources, and he reserves the right to accept or reject conclusions independently of evidence. Take his explanation of Brownson's difficulty with the *Catholic World* as a case in point. In an over-simplified attempt to explain the situation, Mr. Maynard has three distinct causes in the pages of his chapter "Under a Cloud." First, unsigned contributions when Brownson preferred to append his own name to his articles (p. 365); secondly, editorial supervision of Brownson's manuscripts (p. 363); thirdly, too short a space for the Brownson articles (p. 369). This last, according to Mr. Maynard, was the "main difficulty." How he could reach such a conclusion is surprising. The manuscript material in the archives of the University of Notre Dame and the Paulist Fathers, which Mr. Maynard examined, reveals a different story. Brownson and Hewit did not agree in points of doctrine regarding the salvation of non-Catholics, the effects of original sin, and ontologism. These differences led to outbursts when Father Hewit exercised his acknowledged right of editing Brownson's manuscripts. They came close to an open rupture when Brownson, while writing in the *Catholic World,* also cast aspersions on the orthodoxy of that journal and its editor in the *Tablet.* He insinuated in the August 8, 1868, issue of the *Tablet,* that the *Catholic World* was "temporizing," "making concessions," "conciliatory." In the February 20, 1869, issue he labeled Father Hewit's views on original sin as unsound. Mr. Maynard has made no reference to this episode in his volume, though he does note that Brownson, writing to his son, Henry, observed that Father Hewit's "orthodoxy on more than one point is suspect." Mr. Maynard thinks, rather naively, that "a little humor should be applied to such expressions."

Had he examined Hewit's letter to Brownson, dated February 1, 1870, it is difficult to see how he could make such a statement. In that letter Hewit said very directly that he and the other Paulists were "very much aggrieved" by his remarks in the *Tablet*. He remonstrated with Brownson and said that nevertheless all his effort would be in vain. In another letter of February 9, 1870, he clearly told Brownson: "My sole complaint is that you have applied the epithet 'unsound' and other terms to my writing. . . . For a priest these suspicions are like doubts thrown upon the virtue of a nun."

Brownson wrote an apology and the matter closed, but it did leave a scar. In January, 1872, when Brownson withdrew from the *Catholic World*, although he pleaded ill health and age as the causes, the underlying reason was the extreme difference between his and Father Hewit's points of view.

Probably, Mr. Maynard was led to this position in his attempt to refute Doran Whalen — the pen name of Sister Rose Gertrude Whalen, C.S.C. It is regrettable that Mr. Maynard did not in his preface record the criticism which he noted on page 365. In his preface, he merely says in the most charitable kind of understatement: "Doran Whalen incensed the Paulists by her inability to understand that a roaring masculine debate . . . . made no difference to friendship. Her partisan spirit led her to cast unwarrantable aspersions on Fathers Hecker and Hewit" (p. xii). The simple truth is that her book is filled with errors and misstatements. The author who, previous to publication of *Granite for God's House,* showed her incompetency in the field of historical research, did not see the Brownson Papers at Notre Dame — although she gave the impression that she did — seemingly never heard of the Hecker Papers in the Paulist Fathers' Archives at New York, and merely recast the printed works with a not-too-delicate sprinkling of her own imagination. Naturally, such a volume incensed the Paulists, not as Mr. Maynard suggests, but simply because of the injustice done to Fathers Hecker and Hewit, as well as to the *Catholic World.*

Speaking of Hecker's early days Mr. Maynard writes: "But though Hecker writing . . . . fifty years after the event may have been vague about some of his details there is no reason to doubt what he has to relate about his own political activities in 1834" (p. 57). Then he goes on to reproduce the picture of Father Elliott showing Hecker as a boy of eleven proposing resolutions about currency. That there is no shred of accurate evidence to substantiate this, but on the contrary considerable evidence to doubt and reject it, the reviewer has carefully shown in his *Early Years of Isaac Thomas Hecker* (Washington, 1939). Maynard consulted this work in the preparation of his volume. But the reviewer cannot see on what criterion of evidence he can say there is no reason to doubt this picture of Hecker as a juvenile politician. One might pass over the matter in silence were it not for the use made of it in the Americanism controversy. Since this interpretation is historically questionable, that feature of the conflict can no longer be raised—unless, of course, writers such as Mr. Maynard unhistorically insist on raising it again.

As a careful historian, Mr. Maynard has not fulfilled the purpose he stated in his preface. As a writer of popular, though not too critical, biography, he has given to the public a very entertaining and interesting account of Brownson's life and literary work. He is particularly fine in his presentation of Brownson's many-sided character. Certainly any one reading this volume will have a clearer, more coherent idea of the Yankee, the Radical, and the Catholic than can be found in any single volume.

VINCENT F. HOLDEN

Paulist Information Center
New York City

Mother Butler of Marymount. By KATHERINE BURTON. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1944. Pp. xi, 290. $3.00.)

The facile pen of Katherine Burton has given us another study in American Catholic history. Known as one of the outstanding present-day delineators of personality, Mrs. Burton has turned her attention to men and women who have in a special manner left their imprint on the religious history of the United States. In *Mother Butler of Marymount* she deviates from her usual norm. Here she comes closer to the present, treating a woman who was not a foundress, not a convert, and not a native-born American. This is an interesting study largely because of the prodigious undertakings of Mother Butler during her years in this country. The prologue is a summary chapter on the foundation of the Congregation of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary in France in 1849 by the Very Reverend Pierre Gailhac and a pious widow, Madame Appolonie Pelissier Cure, known in religion as Mother St. John. There was a specific need for such a congregation in France at that time. The purpose in the minds of the founders was to give to girls of well-to-do families a type of education definitely Catholic, so that they would later exert their influence for the faith.

To a person interested in the influence of the frontier, this study exemplifies how the environments into which the new foundations were sent challenged, altered, and reacted on the original foundations. From foundations in Portugal, Ireland, England, and the two Americas, subjects were sent back to the novitiate in France, where they imbibed of the spirit of the founders, of French culture, and of the international scope of the Congregation. These in turn returned to the various frontiers with new interests and influences. Unlike many transplanted congregations, the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary have remained international in jurisdication.

Mother Mary Joseph Butler (1860-1940), Irish by birth, became a dominant force in this French community. After a novitiate in France, she spent several years in Portugal. Mrs. Sarah Peter of Cincinnati, who was extremely zealous in inducing groups of sisterhoods to come to the Ohio Valley, made the original arrangements for the first colony of sisters to come to America. Her untimely death changed the first location to Sag Harbor, Long Island (1877).

In the fall of 1903, authorities in the Congregation chose Mother Butler to exercise her administrative abilities in the New World. Within the span of the next thirty-seven years her activities read like an Alger success story. Fortunate in her connections, clear in vision, courageous, daring if you will, Mother Butler envisioned an educational project which would carry out the primary purpose of the institute. Her educational ideal was based on "the three C's: Catholicity, charity, courtesy . . . . to create Catholic women lovers of God" (p. 134). In this she had the support of Cardinal Farley and of her cousin, James Butler, philanthropist. The latter sponsored and endowed her ventures, although he maintained that he received far too much credit for his assistance.

Marymount-on-the-Hudson at Tarrytown began as a select school in 1907, and by 1918 had grown into a college recognized for scholarship and achievement. Branches were established in Los Angeles (1923), Paris (1923), Fifth Avenue, New York (1926), and Rome (1931). In August, 1926, Mother Butler was elected superior general of the Congregation, the first, other than a French woman, elected to that position and the first American superior elected general of an international congregation. Her visitations during the years 1926-1940, in addition to her building projects, would well have taxed the strength of a much younger woman.

The author in this work gives us another cell in the composite history which will some day be written of the influence of religious orders on the history of the Church in the United States. There is a foreword by Archbishop Spellman of New York and a preface by Archbishop Cantwell of Los Angeles. There is no author's preface in which it would have been well to state the purpose of the book. In line with her other works, Mrs. Burton no doubt does not intend this to be considered a definitive biography for the specialist. Her contribution is well recognized, namely, to make these characters, hitherto so meagerly treated, available for the general reader. Her style, insight, and clarity of expression have an appeal which the scientifically-written biography ofttimes lacks, making her works widely read while the latter rest comfortably on library shelves. However, the historian finds the omission of footnotes and documentation irksome, even when there is a feeling that the writer has had access to the source material and is presenting a true picture of the subject. There is no bibliography but an adequate index.

SISTER M. EVANGELINE THOMAS

Marymount College
Salina, Kansas

GENERAL HISTORY

The Jewish Community. Its History and Structure to the American Revolution. By SALO WITTMAYER BARON. Three Volumes. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 1942. Pp. xiv, 374; vi, 366; ix, 572. $2.50 per Volume; $7.50 per Set.)

Dr. Baron, Professor of Jewish History at Columbia University, has long been interested in sociological-historical studies. Some years ago he published an important three-volume work, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews.* Here we have another considerable work on the Jewish Community in three large volumes, two volumes of text and one containing the notes and a very extensive bibliography, including articles and works in modern languages (Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Polish, Russian) as well as in Latin and, naturally, Hebrew. It is certainly a great advantage to have this vast amount of material gathered in such handy form. The index is very full and, therefore, adds considerably to the usefulness of the work.

The first volume is concerned with the Jewish Community as a whole. It traces the development of the community in Palestine; the role of the synagogue in the Babylonian exile, so important religiously as well as in all that touched on the secular life of the people; the organization of the Jews as religious-ethnic groups with a large measure of self-government, first under the successors of Alexander the Great, then under the Roman emperors, grouped around the synagogue and its various annexes, to the end of the fourth century A.D.; next the "Talmudic Consolidation" in the Eastern lands (Palestine, Babylonia, and Persia) where the Jews were so numerous. About these communities, which presented many significant differences from the other countries — differences denied more or less completely at times by some Jewish scholars — the Talmud (Babylonian) especially gives us abundant information. The author notes many interesting traits, several very attractive, as the provisions for the control of prices, weights, and measures, and care of the poor and needy. The next period is described under the title of "The Protected Community" in the Middle Ages under the Moslems and under the Christians. What is striking—whatever the cause may be—is the liberalism of various governments towards their Jewish subjects, a liberalism going far beyond what might be found generally now. The chapter, "Super-Community," describes the different "regional organs" extending over a province or a whole country in the form of chief rabbi or synods or rabbinial-lay conferences, recalling more or less the synods and councils of the Church; the co-operation of communities, even on an international scale, in which at times the Roman community, through the influence of the Papacy, was able to help other communities. Lastly, Professor Baron tells us of minor societies, local societies of religious, educational, or occupational character, dependent ordinarily on voluntary contributions of their members.

The second volume describes the at times rather intricate functioning of the community: membership and relations, the membership in places restricted through arbitrary outside action; lay and ecclesiastical officers with special attention given to the interesting and important subject of the development of the rabbinate. There come next valuable chapters on "Religious Guidance," "Education and Public Enlightenment," "Law Enforcement," "Public Finance," "Social Welfare," and finally a very brief chapter on "Capitalism and Enlightenment."

Professor Baron does not take up the modern period beginning with the American and the French Revolutions; to be really satisfactory, this would require a rather long treatment. Perhaps, we may hope to have without too long delay the work on the modern Jewish Community which the author describes as "in the early stages of preparation." From Chapter I, "Quest for New Forms," in which Dr. Baron briefly sketches some recent developments, one may see the great interest attaching to the modern period. Is Judaism to be regarded merely as a religion? Is it to be treated as an ethnic group? The problem becomes quite different according to the widely differing points of view advocated by various Jewish groups. It is too early to pass judgment on the Zionist attempt in Palestine, or on the policy of the Soviet Union, with which, perhaps, Christian circles are not very familiar. The Soviet Union, apparently most liberal, recognizes the Jews as a national minority, and has even set up, besides autonomous Jewish regions of the Ukraine and Crimea, an "independent" Jewish Republic in the Far Eastern Province in Siberia. But the essentially materialistic *Weltanschauung* of Bolshevism — as well as of Naziism — is incompatible with Judaism as a religion, as well as with any other religion. Hence the traditional vehicle of the Jewish religion was excluded from the ordinary schools, and Zionism prohibited as a counter-revolutionary movement. One may well wonder what will become of Judaism under such "liberalism" — as deadly and destructive in its way as the brutalities of the Hitler savages. Unless there is a *real* change of heart on the part of the Soviets, allowing *real* freedom of religion and worship, one might foresee the end of Judaism in Russia.

Enough has been said to convey to the reader an idea of the great value of this new work of Professor Baron. It will appeal in the first place to Jews, who will learn valuable lessons for the present from their long and often painful history. It will appeal also to outsiders who may learn much, not only facts of history, but as well elements of a better understanding and of a sympathetic appreciation of the Jewish problem of the present.

The bibliography is excellent. The author notes that he has not had direct access to some terms; thus to the work of Belon (III, 236, *non vidi*). The bibliography, in fact, might be said to be superabundant as it includes some items which contribute little, such as Virolleaud's article (III, 328); this is said without denying the value of the article from other points of view. It is to be regretted that the author is not acquainted with the valuable article, "Juifs et Chrétiens" by Félix Vernet in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* (II, 1621-1764). The value of this article lies in the fact that it might have helped the author in understanding better the Christian side. Thus, early Christian writers use the expression Jewish "perfidy," repeated afterwards as a kind of standing formula. It means unbelief, stubbornness in unbelief, without the moral connotation which we are now tempted to give to the word. The author is fair, and means to be fair, to outsiders. Nevertheless, in some instances, we would wish greater circumspection and greater care in the expression of his thought. Professor Baron mentions "the Catholic Order of Redemption" (III, 214) and further on he speaks of the "Redemptionists" "often refusing to include Protestants in their charity" and he goes on to mention "a case" in the eighteenth century when they were unwilling to accept a Lutheran captive thrown into the bargain. This is contrasted with the liberal-mindedness of Jews often ransoming non-Jewish captives. In the first place, the terminology is peculiar. There is no "Order of Redemption," the members of which would be known as "Redemptionists." What is meant is apparently the *Ordo B.M. de mercede redemptionis captivorum,* founded in 1218, known as the Order of Mercy, the members as Mercedarians. Further, the attitude attributed to the "Redemptionists" in the case is contrary to the very elements of Christian charity, and, therefore, while by no means impossible, would require proof. And even if an individual case is established as a fact, what right does one have to say that it happened "often?" The excuse will be here that the author is apparently using second-hand evidence. But what is objectionable is the readiness to accept such evidence without careful investigation. Again, Professor Baron says: "The eastern Church, too, possessed in its Gelasian Sacramentary a special liturgical composition for the dedication of a church building which had previously served as a synagogue" (I, 230). There, exists, of course, a *Sacramentarium Gelasianum,* but, as its very title shows, it is connected with the Roman Church, *Liber sacramentorum Romanae ecclesiae.* Evidently, the author must mean the western Church.

The work has been printed with great care with the result that in spite of the many languages, the number of mistakes is very small. Among those noticed by the reviewer, we have 'leur' for 'leurs' (I, 296), and 'espagnoles', instead of 'espagnols' (III, 163, 10).

EDWARD P. ARBEZ

The Catholic University of America

The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri, 332 B.C.-640 A.D. By RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG, Research Professor in Ancient Civilization, Columbia University. (New York: Herald Square Press, Inc. 1944. Pp. xv, 488. $12.50.)

The mutual penetration of Roman law and the many-layered national laws of Hellenistic color in the eastern provinces of the Empire, is one of the most fascinating subjects of research in ancient legal history. Within the last two or three generations, immensely rich source materials have been laid open by the ever-increasing discoveries of Egyptian papyri. Thousands and thousands of deeds, wills, decrees, and judicial acts have come to light and, as a reward for the exacting toil of deciphering and conjectural redintegration, they have unveiled to the experts, step by step, invaluable details of legal life in this outstanding province of the Near East. Yet, ever since Ludwig Mitteis gave to the new science of legal papyrology its pioneer textbook, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (1912), the very amount, almost embarrassing, of details to be clarified, inevitably and for a long time led students to investigate first the wealth of individual documents and institutions, and to postpone the piecing together of everything into a broad picture of Greco-Roman law in Egypt.

Thus we are presented for the first time, in the present volume of the eminent Polish scholar in exile, with a systematic and comprehensive manual of the whole of private, penal, and procedural law in the papyri, from the time of the Ptolemies to the Byzantine era. In numerous monographic studies, articles and papers Taubenschlag has laid during nearly forty years of research the ground work for this great synopsis and established his own international prestige as one of the foremost authorities in legal papyrology. With his well-known mastery in both sources and bibliography he now builds up, after an introductory chapter on "Egyptian, Greek and Roman Law and their Interrelation," something like the *pandectae* of the law as practised in Egypt in the millenium from 332 B.C. to 640 A.D. For each legal institution the signal features and changes of the various historical periods are carefully worked out; each individual point is supported by copious reference to the pertinent papyri — the table of papyri cited in the work covers about 3500 items — and to their treatment by contemporary writers. We may only regret that the references to the widely scattered modern literature are usually given in such an utterly abridged way, without full titles and data of publication, that the reader who is not himself an expert in the field will often be at a loss to understand them, especially since the bibliography printed at the end is restricted to the author's own writings.

The character of the book as a faithful, systematic inventory of the law recorded in documents which, as a rule, chiefly reflect the every-day routine of legal life, carries with it a certain limitation of purpose. Taubenschlag's text is primarily concerned with the definition of concepts, the detailed study of terminology, and the process of transformation of given rules and terms from one period to another. Thus, the analysis takes on a purely descriptive nature. We must not expect from it a speculative inquiry into legal thought, or a discussion of doctrinal problems, of the tenets and methods of juridical reasoning which underlie the results of legal practice as we read them in the papyri. Likewise, Taubenschlag renounces any historical interpretation of the facts he presents. It was not his aim to examine the how and why, the context of political, economic, social, and religious life of which, ultimately, all legal history is but a particular reflex.

Such voluntary self-restraint is probably to be understood in the light of the immense factual material, the registration and organization of which had of necessity to be the author's main concern. It entails, however, the prospect that the book will be used rather for consultation and reference than for reading and general instruction. But the work will stand as a landmark of life-long, penetrating research which has unified and enriched the findings of modern legal papyrology in an unprecedented and admirable way.

STEPHAN KUTTNER

The Catholic University of America

The Idea of Nationalism. By HANS KOHN, Sydenham Clark Parsons Professor of History in Smith College. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. xiii, 735. $7.50.)

The recognition of the need of a synthesis of the literature of nationalism has inspired Professor Kohn, long a student of this complex subject, to write the first of two projected volumes. The present volume, a study of backgrounds and origins, extends in time from Hellas and Israel to about the beginning of the nineteenth century, confining its attention principally to Europe, but noting as well American developments.

While some of his theses may give rise to disagreement and challenge, there is no disputing the valuable and thought-provoking character of this incisively-written work. In reality, the author has produced an approach to a philosophy of history, with special emphasis on tribalism, universalism, and nationalism in the play and interplay of western European history. Particularly in the latter part of his work dealing with "stirrings in the Old

World," he has brilliantly expounded the theories of the intellectual leaders of modern Europe in the field of nationalist thought.

Professor Kohn has given us no fundamentally new definition of nationalism. He thinks of it as "first and foremost a state of mind, an act of consciousness, which since the French Revolution has become more and more common to mankind." While such factors as language, religion, politics, economics, social and cultural traditions, group consciousness, popular sovereignty, and specific occurrences in the course of history are properly integrated in the fabric of nationalism, the plan of his work evidently precluded an extensive discussion of the part they play in creating the nationalist state of mind. This state of mind or national consciousness, consisting of a common stock of memories and hopes for the future, Kohn sees developing among the ancient Jews for the first time. The three essential traits of nationalism were born here: concept of the chosen people, the awareness of a national history, and the idea of a historic national role, i.e., Messianism. But national Messianism did not become narrow, for side by side with it there developed the universalist Messianic tradition. As the Jew, so the Greek was successful in conquering the barriers of a narrow nationalism and thus handing to posterity in the course of European history a message expressed neither in terms of Jew or Greek, but of man and humanity. The Roman Empire bore a similar message of a world state based on the concept of Stoic equality and universalism, although it failed to realize it. Nevertheless, says Professor Kohn, it did prepare for the universalism of early Christianity and of the Middle Ages.

The author is at his best in discussing the roots of nationalism in the period of the Renaissance and the Religious Revolt, its subsequent historical development, and its expression theoretically in the works of the principal writers. For those who would understand modern Germany and who so easily evolve plans to "solve" the German problem solely in terms of political arrangements, the pages devoted to that country are earnestly recommended.

Elaborate notes, placed at the back of the volume, will repay many-fold the student who takes cognizance of them.

George Waskovich

Hunter College

The Autobiography of Giambattista Vico. Translated from the Italian by Max Harold Fisch and Thomas Goddard Bergin. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1944. Pp. viii, 240. $2.50.)

Giambattista Vico (1668-1744), founder of the philosophy of history, is not well known in this country. Not many are the works in English on him. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* mentions him indirectly twice but carries no leading article dealing specifically with this great thinker and devoted Catholic. Because Vico is so little known here, we welcome this book by Messrs. Fisch and Bergin. It makes available for English readers the autobiography of this eminent "precursor" (he was born on the vigil of St. John the Baptist), at the same time promising us that we shall soon have a translation of the *New Science,* Vico's original study which laid the foundation for the modern era of scientific historiography.

The book falls into two main parts: an introduction and the translation of the autobiography. In the former we are given the genesis of the autobiography, an analysis of the intellectual climate of Vico's day, an explanation and summary of the *New Science,* and a discussion of Vico's influence in Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. One hundred and eight pages of introduction for one hundred pages of autobiography looks like a disregard for balance, but the authors assure us that the disproportion is intentional; the introduction is to serve also for the forthcoming translation of the *New Science.* The second part, the autobiography, up to 1731, is written by Vico, while an account of the period between this date and the author's death, was supplied by Villarosa in 1818. Scholarly notes, a chronological table of events, a list of personal names, and a useful index complete the book.

With the authors' critical edition of the autobiography this reviewer has no cavil. The translation is clear and very readable. They have filled a long-standing lacuna in our history of historiography.

However, one is puzzled by a seeming contradiction in the introduction. Vico was a sincere Catholic who lived, taught, and wrote his faith. The autobiography proves this. Yet, to speak of his religious scruples, to quote with approval such a phrase as "the great skeptic Vico" (p. 93), to state that "It is not possible to trace with any assurance the precise steps by which Vico moved toward a resolution of the conflict between his Catholic piety and his eminently secular if not heretical philosophy" (p. 44), to affirm that when Vico's discoveries are followed out "It [history] has acquired an end of its own which emancipates it from theology, morals and politics" (p. 47) — all this looks very much like infidelity to the true Vico. Again, in the section on "Vico's Reputation and Influence" Vichian thought is represented as the well-spring of historical attitudes in men like Kant, Hegel, Rousseau, Mill, Hume, Sorel, Marx, and Trotsky, to say nothing of the Communists and Fascists. Probably, the contradiction is resolved by pointing out that Vico, along with his primary postulate of an overruling Providence to explain teleology in his ideal history, did enunciate doctrines which, when taken alone and out of their context in the Vichian system, contained principles that later thinkers seized upon with thanks as bases for their materialistic philosophies. If such be the case, why not make the fact clear? Why visit the sins of the children on the father? Or, are Messrs. Fisch and Bergin perhaps trying to claim Vico for the freethinkers of the nineteenth century?

FREDFRICK E. WELFLE

John Carroll University

The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library. A Problem and its Solution. By FREMONT RIDER. (New York: Hadham Press. 1944. Pp. 236. $4.00.)

Dr. Rider, librarian of Wesleyan University and author of many stimulating books and articles in professional periodicals dealing with problems in library administration, presents a carefully thought-out project that is not only stimulating — it is exciting, revolutionary, and epoch-making. This book, which was just received as the REVIEW was going to press, demands the attention of librarians and scholars in every field.

The problem that the author proposes to solve by his "micro-card" is well known, but perhaps not realized fully even by librarians, certainly not by most others. It concerns the astounding growth of our great research libraries. The larger and older university libraries, as well as many college libraries, have doubled their holdings every sixteen years since their foundation. What with the continually increasing realization of the importance of libraries in the educational process, the continued addition of new schools and colleges to universities and their consequent book needs, the growing desire to extend the collections of previously published materials as background literature of all the various disciplines, and the necessity of keeping abreast of the enormous contemporary output of new books, periodicals, and documents, there is little reason to suppose that the parabolic growth will cease. Doubling every sixteen years has continued now for over three centuries. Though we have been able to absorb it thus far, obviously it cannot be done much longer. The palliatives of "weeding out" (always a hazardous process), of various economies of method (such as co-operative cataloging or storage warehouses), and of inter-library co-operation (union catalog co-operation, division-of-fields co-operation, etc.), are merely palliatives and not too satisfactory ones from many viewpoints, as Dr. Rider demonstrates. Some radically different procedure is imperative and it must be applied soon.

Dr. Rider's unique solution for this problem of treating and storing research materials in a large library is just such a radically different procedure and at the same time one that can be begun at once. If the plan is carried through, with all the drastic changes that are here suggested in detail, the research libraries of the future are going to be entirely different in content and methodology, offering marvelously improved services and vastly extended resources — at a saving of millions of dollars each year.

The idea briefly is this: to reduce photographically the printed pages of a book or manuscript and transfer this micro-print of the *whole book* to the back of the ordinary 3" x 5" catalog card. This adaptation of the micro-print process the author calls his "micro-card," which can carry on its back as many as 250 or more pages, and can be read with the help of a reflected-light reading machine or a binocular microscope. Such machines Dr. Rider prophesies will be produced on a large scale in the future and will be smaller and cheaper than typewriters and just as common.

The micro-card solves with almost miraculous simplicity all the factors of the growth problem. The original cost of the "book" will be about five cents or less. Binding costs evaporate. The storage cost element can be reduced *one hundred per cent* since the book will be placed on the hitherto unused back of the catalog card. The micro-card arrives in the library already cataloged (classification and call numbers are now unnecessary), ready to be filed and then circulated immediately. No waiting in line at the circulation desk, no delay while searches are made in departmental libraries, in the bindery, or in the file of books charged out. As soon as the reader has located the card in the catalog, whether it be under author, title, or one of the subject headings, he has his desired book immediately at hand and ready to be charged out by the library assistant there in attendance. Dozens of "books" can be withdrawn at a time from the library and slipped into your coat pocket. In your own study all the important books in your field can be conveniently housed in a card file drawer! And these are just a few of the implications with which the reader of this book is challenged. For further example, why not use micro-card for the quick and effective rehabilitation of devastated libraries in the war areas?

Fantastic, perhaps, but then so was the idea of printing in the fifteenth century. The author does not wish to give the false impression that all libraries and all the collections of the library will be affected by this new development. The revolving collections of more frequently used books will still be found on the shelves for consultation and study. But for the vast amount of material which is seldom used and yet must be conserved for its research value the micro-card is the only entirely satisfactory answer to date. Theses, maps and charts, newspapers, periodicals, manuscript materials, and government documents fall into this category, and it is just such valuable source materials as these that for lack of space and funds and time to process them are most neglected and hence inaccessible to the research worker.

Skepticism quickly gives way to enthusiasm as the questions and doubts even now rising in the reader's mind about such matters as copyright control, photographic technicalities, library administration, publication and distribution of micro-cards, are answered satisfactorily. Dr. Rider is one of the ablest of our American librarians and he is one peculiarly fitted by a happy combination of foresight and wide experience in administration, bibliography, editorship, and publishing to chart this map for the future. He has hit upon and developed an idea that is deeply significant and far-reaching in its results.

JAMES J. KORTENDICK

The Catholic University of America

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Anglo-Saxon England. By F. M. STENTON, F.B.A., Professor of Modern History in the University of Reading. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1944. Pp. vii, 747. $7.50.)

It is gratifying to learn that the publication of the *Oxford History of England,* edited by Professor G. N. Clark, had not been indefinitely suspended as a result of wartime conditions. In the first volume to appear since 1939, Professor Stenton treats the period which extends from the emergence of the earliest English kingdoms to the foundation of the Anglo-Norman monarchy (*ca.* 550-1087). This is the period of which F. W. Maitland once wrote: "Many an investigator will leave his bones to bleach on this trackless waste before it be charted." Maitland knew as much as any man about the period when he wrote those words nearly fifty years ago. Some parts of Anglo-Saxon history will probably never be charted through sheer lack of materials, but Mr. Stenton's book is ample proof that the period as a whole is now far from the state of a trackless waste. Slowly and painfully the creeping scholarship of highly-specialized investigators has lighted many a dark corner and opened up new general perspectives. Professor Stenton himself, whose bones have happily not yet been left to bleach along the way, has made valuable contributions of this sort; but in the present volume it is rather for a remarkable work of synthesis that we are indebted to him. Only a scholar of his ability could have put to contribution so many fields of specialist research. We had the right to expect of him a work that would be abreast of the latest and the best, but one is amazed on reading this volume that even he could have woven with such skill an account which draws not only upon the usual literary, diplomatic, and legal sources, but upon the most solidly-established findings of archaeology, philology, place-name study, numismatics, and other specialist sciences, among which one so recent as aerial photography has not been neglected.

In regard to the various aspects of the Anglo-Saxon period, the volume is well planned and proportioned: political, social and economic, ecclesiastical, cultural, and intellectual history all find adequate treatment. The chapters (IX, XIV) dealing with the structure of English society are among Mr. Stenton's best. Years of personal research have made him the acknowledged authority in this field and it is with the touch of a master that he traces the development of English society from the age of the oldest Anglo-Saxon laws through the changes brought about by the growth of royal power and the extension of private lordship to the generalization of feudalism after the Norman conquest.

In so brief a review it is impossible to do justice to the many excellent features of the book. Mention should be made, however, of the author's objective presentation of the scholarship on a host of obscure and often controverted points: bookland and folkland; the origins of the hundreds, of private jurisdiction, of the jury system, of English towns; the importance of the council in the Old English state; the eleventh-century earldoms, etc. The many points of contact noted between England and continental Europe show the Anglo-Saxon state to have been much less isolated than was long supposed. One might cite the affinities between the settlers of Kent and the Franks of Gaul, the foreign policy of kings like Offa, Athelstan, and Cnut, and the cultural influences repeatedly at work back and forth between England and the continent. It may be a surprise to many a general reader to find that Mr. Stenton's comparison between England and Normandy in the eleventh century, based on the most recent research, is distinctly to the advantage of the English state. Again, the favorable view taken of Edward the Confessor's ability and energy is in contrast with the traditional picture of a saintly man but weak ruler.

Almost one-third of the book is devoted to the Anglo-Saxon Church. The account is thoroughly sympathetic. Sketches of men like St. Theodore, St. Boniface, St. Dunstan, and Lanfranc are veritable gems, while many a lesser figure, too, is made to live. Full justice is done to the conversion of England, the development of a diocesan organization, the growth and importance of parish life, monasticism in its two great periods, and the reorganization of the Church carried through by Lanfranc. One of the freshest chapters is the one entitled "The Tenth Century Reformation;" it should do much to offset the prevalent notion of a backward and insular English Church in the late Anglo-Saxon period.

This review must not end without calling attention to the extensive critical bibliography of both original sources and modern works, for which students in particular will be deeply grateful. And, to complete a truly satisfying volume, the author's wife, a scholar in her own right, has carefully compiled an exhaustive index which is a model of its kind.

GEORGE B. FLAHIFF

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

Bedae Opera de Temporibus. Edited by Charles W. Jones, Cornell University. (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1943. Pp. xiii, 416. $8.00; to members of the Academy, $6.40.)

With this work Professor Jones does his part to antiquate the charge that Bede has been unfortunate in his editors. The present *Opera de temporibus,* including the *De temporum ratione,* the *De temporibus,* the *Epistola ad Pleguinam,* and the *Epistola ad VVicthedum,* is without question a masterly edition, worthy to stand beside Plummer's *Opera historica.* Though Bede's computistical tracts have not the broad appeal of the historical works, they do provide "the best introduction to the ecclesiastical calendar" — that framework of all mediaeval life — and considerable material for specialists in the various disciplines from diplomatics to philology and the history of education. To facilitate comprehension of the treaties and to set Bede's work in its proper perspective in the history of time-reckoning, Jones has devoted approximately one-third of the book to an historical survey of pre-Bedan Easter computations. This, as well as the notes to the *De temporum ratione,* reflects a familiarity with sources and a mature grasp of the whole subject which make for sincere but unpedantic scholarship.

In the editing of Bede's works the wealth of manuscripts is embarrassing. For the *de temporum ratione* alone, Dr. Jones lists 133 manuscripts, of which he has examined and described 104. The history of the transmission of the text is obscure because of the lack of any eighth-century manuscript, the rapid multiplication of texts in the Carolingian period, and the great uniformity of these. Jones presents, therefore, an eclectic text, based upon a full collation of ten manuscripts and a partial collation of five others, all being of ninth-century, continental provenience. In the pursuit of Bede's sources the editor has uncovered new manuscript material, particularly the valuable Sirmond codex which was considered lost since the seventeenth century. He also reviews the problems of the group of Easter tracts known as "Irish Forgeries," and reacts against MacCarthy's claims of fraud. Jones himself is first to disclaim having solved the problem of Bede's sources, yet he does show that about a hundred works were used by the monk for these computistical treatises either as direct sources or indirect as in the case of Macrobius' *Saturnalia,* which Bede probably used from an Irish fragment. The abundance of Irish materials has led the editor to stress the predominance of the Irish educational element in Northumbria, and certainly as far as scientific works are concerned, his claim seems to have validity. The wider claims will await further detailed proof, however.

The textual accuracy, the full critical apparatus, the detailed notations of sources, and the introductory survey make this an excellent edition, one to do honor to its several sponsors. The Mediaeval Academy has provided its usual fine format.

SISTER M. THOMAS AQUINAS CARROLL

Mount Mercy College
Pittsburgh

William, Archbishop of Tyre. A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea. Translated and Annotated by EMILY ATWATER BABCOCK and A. C. KREY. Two Volumes [Columbia University Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, No. XXXV.] Edited by Austin P. Evans. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. xii, 556; 553. $13.50.)

Among the significant products of the twelfth-century renaissance was the increased volume and quality of historical writing. And one of the outstanding contributions in this field was William of Tyre's *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum,* a history of the crusades and of the Latin Orient from the first crusade to the 1180's. Indeed, it may be regarded as one of the classics of mediaeval civilization. Curiously, there has not yet appeared a modern critical edition, and students of the Latin Orient have had to use the Latin text made available nearly a hundred years ago by A. Beugnot and A. Le Prevost in the cumbersome folios of the *Recueil des historiens des croisades.* As a consequence, the appearance of this, the first English translation, prepared for the Columbia University Records of Civilization by Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey, is an event of no small importance. For, although the translators have relied on the Beugnot-Le Prevost version and have properly emphasized the need of a critical edition, they have added notes and an introduction of some fifty pages. These two volumes, therefore, are more than a translation. They constitute a major contribution to mediaeval scholarship.

The scholarly introduction includes a biographical sketch of William in which Professor Krey has skillfully summarized the efforts of a succession of scholars and added a number of his own suggestions. He leans to the view that although William was a native of the kingdom of Jerusalem, his parents were of "Italian, or Italian-Norman, origin," and that after a good foundation in the liberal arts had been laid in the East, William pursued more advanced studies in Italy, perhaps in law. A talented ecclesiastic and statesman, he served his Church and his king with distinction not only as archbishop and chancellor, but as special ambassador on important missions. Thus, he became familiar with the papal curia, attended the Fourth Lateran Council, and was an observant delegate to the court of the emperor at Constantinople. And if petty partisan politics deprived him of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, posterity may be thankful that a somewhat larger measure of leisure enabled him to devote more time to his historical researches.

Though not specially trained for historical writing, William nevertheless heeded the request of King Amaury I and commenced his work, probably in 1167. Professor Krey has shown how William persisted, despite the manifold concerns of Church and kingdom, how he gained in stature as an historian, and how the original plan for a *Gesta Amalrici* broadened into the *Gesta regum*. The importance of his *Gesta orientalium principum*, or oriental history, unfortunately lost, is also indicated. Aware of William's weaknesses, notably his errors in chronology, Professor Krey justly insists that "few writers in any time have viewed their own age with sterner impartiality and insight, or with fuller understanding." The introduction also includes an interesting section concerning William's influence on later writers.

As the translators have indicated, William was a competent latinist with a wide knowledge of the classics. But his unique "refinement of expression and outlook . . . . the particular quality of his style . . . . can not be explained solely on the basis of his reading of the Latin classics; for the broad human tolerance and genteel scepticism which marked his writing was also derived from acquaintance with Arabic literature and from association with cultivated Arabs in the cosmopolitan and sophisticated society of the East." Mrs. Babcock, who is responsible for the translation, has happily preserved a great deal of the flavor of the original.

William of Tyre's work deserves an audience far greater than that group of scholars interested primarily in the Crusades. And it is to be hoped that the present version, skillfully edited and felicitously translated, may reach that audience. Only one or two minor criticisms can be made. To the bibliographical citations bearing on Urban II, an article in this REVIEW (XXV, January, 1940, 459-466), summarizing recent literature, might be added along with H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III* (Jena, 1936), for Pope Eugenius III. Moreover, the implication in the notes that Tripoli might perhaps be considered a "vassal state of the kingdom of Jerusalem," does not necessarily follow from the text (II, 400, 448). It is possible that Count Raymond's claims to the regency there mentioned, were based on his lordship of Tiberias. But these are minutiae. The two volumes are a credit to American mediaeval scholarship and a significant addition to the Columbia series.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN

New York University

MODERN HISTORY

The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734 as Revealed in Despatches of the Venetian Baili. By MARY LUCILLE SHAY. [Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. XXVIII, 3.] (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1944. Pp. 165. Cloth $2.00; paper $1.50.)

This rather detailed account of a brief period in Ottoman history is based on the despatches of four Venetian *baili*: Giovanni Emo, Francesco Gritti, Daniele Dolfin, and Angelo Emo, as found in the Hiersemann Manuscripts purchased by the University of Illinois in 1923, and in the manuscripts of the R. Archivio de Stato di Venezia and Biblioteca Marciana in Venice. After the brief introductory chapter there follows the historical account itself which is divided into the following three chapters: "Political and Social Conditions of the Ottoman Empire," "The Relations of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Venice," and "Russian-Turkish Interest in Persia and Its Effect on the Porte's Foreign Policy." Then follow the glossary, bibliography, and index.

The conversion of haphazard despatch material into a continuous narrative has been accomplished with great skill and in the best tradition of English historical writing. This study, though it does not purport to be a revolutionary one, furnishes, nevertheless, interesting new interpretations and amplifies what knowledge we already possess regarding the subject.

The final chapter — by far the longest — treats of the most important aspect of Ottoman foreign policy of the epoch, and it is for this reason that a few remarks may not be out of place. Inasmuch as Georgia — and Caucasia in general — figures conspicuously in the story, playing the important, albeit involuntary, role of an apple of discord between the three empires, Ottoman, Russian, and Persian, a certain acquaintance with its history may be demanded of the student of Ottoman history. Thus, *e.g.*, one looks in vain in the bibliography for Brosset's classical *Histoire de la Géorgie*, or *A History of the Georgian People* by W. E. D. Allen (London, 1932). It would also seem preferable not to refer to the King of Georgia as "Kahn of Georgia," "of the Georgians," or " Tiflis" (pp. 95 ff.). The sovereigns of Georgia have always — from classical times to the end, and from Graeco-Roman monuments to papal documents — been given in the West the style of king, which is the exact equivalent of the Georgian royal title *Mep‘e*. "Kahn" may have been the Turkish usage, but to leave it unchanged in English is like saying "Tsar of Persia" when treating of the Russian-Persian relations of the time. Finally, the then Patriarch of Georgia (Catholicus of Iberia) was not of the "Dimenti family" (p. 164); his name was Domenti IV (1705-1742) and he was King Vakhtang VI's brother.

Now a few onomastic remarks. It is unfortunate that in rendering the name of the Russian resident at Constantinople, R. Nisbet Bain's erroneous spelling: *Neplyneff* (cf. *Cambridge Modern History,* VI, 304) should have been preferred throughout the work to the correct form: *Nepluyeff* or *Nepluiev* (also *Neplyueff*) which is mentioned parenthetically in the index (p. 164), as well as given by the same R. Nisbet Bain in the *Cambridge Modern History,* V, 545. Instead of *Romanzoff* (pp. 120-123, 128, 164), *Rumyantzeff* or *Rumiantsev,* of course, should be written. One may also wonder why the outmoded forms: *Achmet* and *Mustapha* have been preferred (*e.g.,* p. 17) to the more adequate transcriptions of *Ahmad* or *Ahmed* and *Mustafà,* especially as other Turkish names are on the whole very well transcribed.

Notwithstanding these and a few other minor onomastic inadequacies, this work is a very valuable contribution to the study of Ottoman and East European history.

CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgetown University

France Reviews Its Revolutionary Origins: Social Politics and Historical Opinion in the Third Republic. By PAUL FARMER, Instructor in History, Colgate University. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1944. Pp. vi, 145. $2.25.)

This is a careful examination of the various interpretations of the French Revolution made by major French historians in the past century, particularly under the Third Republic. By summarizing and quoting at length the works of these writers, Mr. Farmer has presented a commendable exposition of all their principal theses, but the aim of his study is to explain the great variety of judgments and their acceptance by certain groups in French society. His thesis is that between the judgments of the historians and the social forces operative in French life in the periods when they wrote, there is a very close correlation. In fact, this is so pronounced that we cannot escape concluding in the composition and acceptance of interpretations of great historical events that have a meaning to successive generations — and what great historical event has not? — more depends on contemporary social forces than on the accessible historical materials. It is to Mr. Farmer's credit that in his conclusion he has attempted an answer to this problem, not by asserting that all historical knowledge is relative but by distinguishing between truth and general credence.

Although his principal concern is the historians in the Third Republic, the author summarizes in an introductory chapter the interpretations made by their early nineteenth-century predecessors. In nearly every instance these writers were either constitutional-monarchists or republicans, who saw in the Revolution the attempted realization in France of their respective political ideals, but what is most significant is that they wrote in an era when the question of the form of government was uppermost in men's minds. Buchez, whose interpretation was in accord with his Catholic social democratic philosophy, made little impression on his contemporaries, not because of the demerits of his philosophy but because of its lack of popularity. Of all the historians of this period surely De Tocqueville was the most objective, but even here the fact that he showed less sympathy for the Revolution than his predecessors is a reflection of the disillusionment of the 1850's that came in the wake of the Second Republic's stormy history. Incidentally, the years of Buchez's life are given as 1776-1860 instead of 1796-1865 (p. 13), and the year of Blanc's death as 1892 instead of 1882 (p. 15).

While the Third Republic is a distinct period in both French history and in the historiography of the Revolution, the great dividing line for both in the post-Napoleonic era is, says Mr. Farmer, the 1890's. It is in that decade that the greatest social transformations occurred — the ascendancy of industry over agriculture, the entrenchment of socialism, the advent of the new imperialism, the intensification of nationalism and laicism. Consequently, it is not a mere coincidence that while the interpretations of the past half-century have "proceeded from new bases," the judgments of the Revolution in the first decades of the republic were merely modifications of those made prior to 1870. First came Taine's great indictment, which drew forth defenses of the Revolution from a group of republican "opportunists." Taine's attack upon the Revolution as a system of ideas leading to social disorder and the popularity of his work were a reflection of the deep fear of the right which, while accepting liberalism, was opposed to real democracy. The works of his opponents such as Avenel reflected the views of men for whom the Revolution's great legacy was its system of ideas. Finally, in this period came the volumes of Sorel, which reflected the emergence of a conservative republicanism in French life. The absence at the same time of constitutional-monarchist defenses of the Revolution is further evidence of the close correlation between political sympathies and historical opinion of the Revolution.

At the turn of the present century under the pressure of the left for social reform, conservative republicans and royalists joined forces in defense of social conservatism and politically they became less sympathetic to parliamentarism. Of the four historians — Aulard, Madelin, Jaurès, and Cochin — whose interpretations are examined in the chapter covering the quarter century preceding 1914, surely the last two are of greater significance. What Aulard did, taking advantage of the great expansion of factual knowledge about the Revolution, was to bring up to date the works of those "opportunists" who had earlier opposed Taine. In turn, Madelin, availing himself of the same advances, brought Taine up to date. With

Jaurès, however, came a socialist modification of the official republican interpretation of the Revolution. Like Mathiez, who later incorporated most of his views, Jaurès described the Revolution "in terms of the material basis of society in production relations." Between the republican center and the republican left there was agreement against the right as well as disagreement between themselves both in politics and in the interpretation of the Revolution. Cochin, on the other hand, developed an interpretation which condemned not France, as had Taine, but simply the minority who had brought on the disaster. Between this judgment and the twentieth-century nationalist rightist's contempt for parliamentarism there is a close correlation.

The final chapter is an examination of the works of the most recent historians, principally Mathiez and Gaxotte. In the works of each is the same correlation with contemporary political tendencies and social forces as in all their predecessors. Most interesting in this period, however, are the contributions of the more orthodox republicans, Lefebvre, Sagnac, Pariset, and especially Guyot, whose revision of the older judgments of the Directory reflects the twentieth-century moderate republican's appreciation of the similarity of his own position to that of the men of 1795-1799.

Surely no writer should be criticized for failing to do what he has clearly shown to be outside his concern. Yet, in spite of Mr. Farmer's concluding remarks, it does seem to the reviewer that many readers will put down this volume more inclined than ever to dismiss some of the greatest works on the Revolution as mere "tracts for the times." That this will some day be the general estimate of Taine, Cochin, Mathiez, Sorel, and Guyot is much less likely than it will be of Gaxotte, Madelin, and even Aulard.

A. PAUL LEVACK

Fordham University

Clemenceau. By GEOFFREY BRUUN. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. x, 225. $3.00.)

In this scholarly, readable re-evaluation of Clemenceau, Professor Bruun has written a worthy companion to the biographies of Nietzsche and of Napoleon III, earlier volumes in the Makers of Modern Europe series. More than simply the biography of a man, it is almost a condensed history of the Third French Republic.

From the days of the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune, Clemenceau conceived a deep dislike of "monarchists, the General Staff, dogmatic priests [*sic*], socialist pretenders with impractical panaceas." Hence his association with the Radical Republicans during the early 1880's. Professor Bruun suggests two motives, not often admitted by "liberal" historians, for the drive against the Catholic Church: anti-clerical legislation, unlike other features of the radical program, would not antagonize either capital or labor; laicizing the schools would provide the radicals with jobs to hand out. Clemenceau supported the Ferry program. But later in the 1900's he opposed the full enforcement of the Education Law of 1904, since the complete elimination of the teaching orders would lead to a state monopoly of education. It was Clemenceau, too, who eased the application of the Separation Law of 1905 in the matter of the "associations cultuelles" so as to bring about a *modus vivendi* with the Papacy; it was he who appointed the strongly Catholic Ferdinand Foch as commandant of the École de Guerre.

Professor Bruun carries Clemenceau through the period of Boulanger (first sponsored by Clemenceau, then bitterly opposed), and the Dreyfus affair, with Clemenceau fighting to defeat the monarchists and militarists, "to republicanize the high command and bring it under civilian control." From 1906 to 1909, as head of the cabinet, Clemenceau worked for better relations with Russia and tried to commit Britain to military support of France in case of war. From 1909 to 1914, in opposition, he helped to engender a war spirit in France. Still out of office in the early days of the war, Clemenceau, with his pen, rallied France from defeatism, denounced the "peace now" advocates, and became himself the soul of French resistance. Again president of the council of ministers in November, 1917, he revived French morale and drove France to the final ounce of war effort.

Confronted with the sudden "spectre of peace," the Allies found themselves unprepared. When Max of Baden approached Wilson in October, 1918, Clemenceau feared that Wilson might commit the Allies to a peace without annexation or indemnity. Such a peace, he felt, would ruin France, ravaged by war, declining in population, and facing a dubious future, unless the fruits of peace were plentiful. But Wilson, handling Max of Baden with consummate skill, merely agreed to transmit to the Allies the German request for an armistice, with the eventual peace to be based on the Fourteen Points. House prodded Clemenceau into accepting this basis with the threat of a separate American peace with Germany. But Clemenceau, Lloyd-George, and Orlando, with Wilson's knowledge and House's acquiescence (charges Professor Bruun), "accepted the Wilsonian program, but . . . . [with] . . . . an interpretation so elastic, so attenuated it prefigured the wry compromises that were to come."

At the peace conference itself, Clemenceau and Wilson were clashing personalities, approaching the problems of peace from opposite poles — realism and idealism, secret treaties and Fourteen Points, alliance system and League of Nations. Distrusting Wilson's "brave new world," Clemenceau sought to make Germany weak and France strong. "A Cassandra dowered with a desperate foresight," he feared that "guarantees would fail, alliances disintegrate, defenses crumble." Getting only Alsace-Lorraine, the hybrid Saar Basin settlement, and temporary occupation of the Rhineland, he felt that France had secured too little. So, too, did other Frenchmen. Attacked by ardent nationalists, Clemenceau, "père la victoire" in 1918, became "perd la victoire" in 1919.

Although his biographer does not gloss over his shortcomings or palliate incidents not entirely creditable, Clemenceau comes out a crusty but sympathetic figure — a ruthless realist, courageous, cynical but never abandoning faith in his own idea of democracy. The style is sprightly and entertaining enough to appeal to the general reader. But the work is a scholarly, critical, competent job that must command the attention of all students of the Third French Republic.

FRANCIS A. ARLINGHAUS

University of Detroit

The Development of Modern Italy. By CECIL J. S. SPRIGGE. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1944. Pp. 216. $2.75.)

This book contains an excellent survey of the unification of Italy and also an account of the "up and down" of Mussolini. Underlying the narrative there is always the peering into the future by the *Manchester Guardian's* Rome correspondent and friend of Croce. He reminds the reader that the book is for his "fellow journalists," so that the critical historian will not expect the customary apparatus whereby to check the author's statements. Mr. Sprigge explains: "Discretion forbids the mention of individual Italians to whom I am beholden. They include victims of Mussolini's police rule, political exiles," etc. (p. 207).

In general the account presents the Papacy's position in the struggle to integrate the conglomerate groups into a natural unity, in an honest manner. He pictures Pius IX "as despoiled by Piedmont," Pius X's "formal protestation against the usurpation of the House of Savoy" (p. 93), and Benedict XV's "peace efforts" (p. 139). He praises especially Don Luigi Sturzo, "a brilliant but level-headed Sicilian priest of sure theological orthodoxy" .... who stood as a "barrier against the social upheaval which the fanatics of the Left contemplated" (p. 180).

He even reminds us that Mussolini was welcomed before 1922 and until the League of Nations' sanctions quarrel in 1935. Among the English, Il Duce found slight disfavor. Mr. Sprigge has little to say about the notorious mayor of Rome, Nathan, and he gives no critical opinion of the Lateran Treaty.

All in all, his treatise is an antidote against the volume of Salvemini and LaPiana, *What to Do With Italy* (New York, 1943). In their polemic the two naturalized Americans proved themselves to be fervent Italian nationalists who feared that Great Britain intends to take some of Italy's territory. If Mr. Sprigge's long introduction to his book would give the reader that suspicion, he might keep in mind the story related in the July *Newsweek* about the British and American economists discussing the Keynes and White plans for post-war monetary stability. After a lengthy discussion one of the Americans turned to one of the Britishers and rather bluntly accused Keynes of having designed a plan which would enable the British Empire to get our goods for nothing. The reply he received from the Britisher was: "I think that is a fair accusation, and our defense is simply that we thought that was what America wanted." Apparently Mr. Sprigge has no intention to so "condition" us towards Italy. His conclusion is: "The Englishman's task is not to interfere with future Italian developments, but to judge them realistically and, by making clear to the Italian nation our own standpoint in regard to matters of necessary joint import to the two nations, to stimulate the Italians to clear their own minds" (p. 207).

LEO L. RUMMEL

St. Augustine Priory
Madison, Wisconsin

AMERICAN HISTORY

William Penn, 1644-1718, A Tercentenary Estimate. By WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT, President Emeritus of Haverford College. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1944. Pp. vii, 185. $2.00.)

It is fitting that a work on Penn should appear in 1944, the three hundredth anniversary of his birth. Dr. Comfort has seen that his book is the first of its kind to be issued this year as the date of the preface is January 1, 1944. In the preface, after the author refers to the fact that the main course of Penn's life has been traced many times, he states: "What the modern reader may wish to know is how Penn became the kind of man he was and what inspired the 'Holy Experiment' . . . . " The author aims to "make clear the connection of Quakerism with the fundamental institutions of Pennsylvania." This is the thesis of the work.

The subject matter has been arranged with a certain regard to unity, enabling the reader to assemble in his mind various details on the development of Penn's character. We learn about his inclinations, his environment, and his response to his environment — how he helped to reshape the conditions of his time. Throughout, here and there, are dramatic episodes which enliven the narrative.

After the appropriate sketch of Penn's life which reveals scholarly research by Dr. Comfort, the author considers the religious and moral background of the time. He gives an extended explanation of the tenets of the Society of Friends which had originated a few years subsequent to the birth of Penn who, after his conversion to Quakerism at the age of twenty-three, became one of its leading exponents. The author shows that the interest of the young man " in religious toleration and freedom of conscience developed from the sufferings of the Quakers in which he shared." We are told how, "in the New World where he had a fair field to plant his ideals, he (Penn) based his commonwealth upon his religion and produced a new type of 'theocratic Democracy.'" Penn believed that the government of his province was like that of the Israelites, under the immediate direction of God.

Penn as the man of letters, is shown to be a "reader of unusual breadth and intelligence." His controversial pamphlets and articles on government quote from an amazing list of authorities on religion and toleration, but with no reference to Suarez or Bellarmine who had died in the beginning of the seventeenth century. However, "his theological writings," says Dr. Comfort, "are as deadwood to us but not so his way of life." Although Penn for many years after his conversion to Quakerism, engaged in the violent religious disputations characteristic of the time, he always showed his love for his adversaries. The author makes the following comment about a certain attack the twenty-four-year-old neophyte, Penn, made upon Catholic doctrine in which he asked a number of questions: "To these questions the Roman Catholics, of course, paid no heed." The meaning of the words "of course" may not be clear to the reader. While not having the deep insight of Catholics regarding the basis for their belief, the author seems to know that Catholic teaching was not what Penn thought it was, and he feels that Catholics did the proper thing in ignoring Penn's invitation to controversy. As Dr. Comfort says, "The warmth of his (Penn's) attack upon Catholic faith and practice is not in the best taste."

The author feels "humble in trying to estimate the historical importance of such a many-sided man as William Penn." A statement of this kind attracts attention. The one who makes such a statement must be intrinsically humble himself. Pride does not make him contend with all critics of Penn. The author is willing to admit all they say about the great founder, but he still portrays a man "so human and kindly that we should like to talk with him."

William Bishop Schuyler

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Development of the Colonial Newspaper. By Sidney Kobre. (Pittsburgh: Colonial Press, Inc. 1944. Pp. xi, 188. $3.50.)

The author of this little volume is associated with the Columbia University School of Journalism. In the foreword he adverts to the shortcomings of other treatments of the subject, arising in part from neglect of the causes of the appearance of the colonial newspaper and its functions in the business world; he then states his objective as search for the roots of the press. He is convinced that the colonial newspaper was a "dynamic social institution functioning in provincial society," participating actively in the interplay of forces, influencing and moulding its environment and in turn affected by it, the mirror of the changing American character and social institutions.

A brief inquiry into the social background of the colonial newspaper opens the investigation. There follows a longer consideration of the appearance of the newspaper and its early vicissitudes in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York between 1690 and 1725. Interest is next centered on the multiplication of newspapers throughout the colonies between 1725 and 1750, special emphasis being given to the centers just mentioned, with a casual glance at those of Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, and Rhode Island. The longest and most important section of the book is devoted to the Revolutionary newspaper from 1750 to 1783; this, however, is restricted to the press in Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore so as to keep the study within limits, and because these papers are regarded as representative. Finally, a brief chapter appraises the colonial paper as a social institution, outlines the development of uniformities and special characteristics, and enumerates the mechanical facilities making for change. Charts, tables, and illustrations are scattered throughout the text; the bibliography of newspapers and secondary works will prove helpful, but, unfortunately, there is no index. The style lacks distinction, but the book abounds in human interest.

Charles H. Metzger

West Baden College

Ante-Bellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860. By F. Garvin Davenport. [Annals of America, Volume V]. (Oxford, Ohio: Mississippi Valley Press. Pp. xviii, 238. $3.50.)

For a sound interpretation of the somewhat complex social and intellectual life of Kentucky during the sixty years prior to the War between the States, the scholar, or the casual reader, may turn with equal gratification to Professor Davenport's volume. Drawn largely from manuscripts, public documents, and newspapers, material depicting the development of cultural interests in this early nineteenth-century outpost of civilization has been selected with discrimination and with a certain skill at synthesizing. Detailed descriptions of the sociable Kentucky mountaineer, the glamorous belle of the fifties, and the hospitable slave-holder furnish the reader vivid and distinctive pictures set against a background unique to the Bluegrass State.

The author notes that society in Louisville, composed as it was of an important foreign population together with representatives from every section of the United States, was more generalized, more cosmopolitan than in any other Kentucky town, and that sectional origins were not very important (p. 24). It may be noted, however, that national origins proved disastrously important for the Irish and the German in the last decade of the ante-bellum period. Although it might be assumed that the leveling influence of frontier democracy should have tended to abolish any narrow proscription against the foreign-born citizen and that religious bigotry which was fused with the anti-foreign aspect should have surrendered to constitutional liberalism, actually, neither of these correctives was realized in Louisville.

Two chapters deal with private and public schools, viz., "College Halls," and "Crusaders for Public Education." It is not surprising, nor unseemly, that the head of the department of history at Transylvania College should give a predominant place to the early, precarious history of this venerable institution whose valuable archival sources are so familiar to him. Yet, individuals whose interests are focused on smaller and less-favored institutions may lament the proportionately scant attention accorded them, however legitimate the reason for its omission. Of special interest to the reviewer would have been the inclusion of Catholic institutions on a college level such as St. Joseph's, Bardstown (listed on page 54 as a college, and on page 179 as an academy) with its competent clerical staff of European-trained professors, established as a diocesan college in 1819 but transferred to the Society of Jesus in 1848; St. Mary's College, Marion County, founded in 1821 and alternately under diocesan and Jesuit control; St. Ignatius Literary Institution, Louisville, also known as St. Aloysius College, 1844-1852. Conspicuously absent from the private school list, which, indeed, does not claim to be exhaustive, are the numerous academies conducted by Catholic sisterhoods which offered an education beyond first lessons, then inadequately provided under public and Protestant auspices.

The valuable contributions to the medical sciences, chiefly to surgery, made by such "skillful operators as Brashear, McDowell, Dudley and Gross" are interestingly recounted; scientific research along geological, botanical, and chemical lines is accorded a chapter; the growth of the artistic spirit, as a criterion of social progress, is exemplified in the patronage extended to literature, architecture, and the arts. In his treatment of the "Great Revival" and its aftermath, Professor Davenport, drawing largely from original sources especially in dealing with the Shakers, gives an impartial exposition of the zeal displayed by diverse religious groups in attempting to overcome the religious apathy which characterized the period.

The following minor errors, bane of all proof readers, are noted: Reverend Stephen Theodore Badin's name is spelled "Baden" in the index; there is no indication of footnote 80 (p. 140), where, also, "horsebark" appears for "horseback" and there is a slip in the spelling of Bishop Flaget's middle name (p. 141). Although a running appraisal of the sources used is hindered by consigning the footnotes to the back of the book, the advantages of not encumbering the page and distracting the lay reader are obvious. The volume has an attractive format, while a complete index should insure a convenient and extensive use of the work as a reference to a colorful period of Kentucky history.

SISTER AGNES GERALDINE McGANN
Nazareth College

One Hundred Great Years. The Story of the Times-Picayune from its Founding to 1940. By THOMAS EWING DABNEY. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1944. Pp. xii, 552. $4.00.)

A century is a long time in America, and any institution, especially a great newspaper, which has seen so much history should have its own story written. For its autobiography, the *Times-Picayune* of New Orleans selected a competent chronicler in Thomas Ewing Dabney, a native of the English side of Canal Street, a trained scholar with a year at Harvard, a consul-general at El Salvador, a journalist, and a novelist who knows his city and the Southland. The *Times-Picayune* recorded a great deal of municipal politics and southern history since its foundation by two printers, Francis Asbury Lumsden and George W. Kendall in 1837, the year of the panic or "pressure." Under various editors, the paper has maintained a personality, a conscience, a conciliatory attitude on controversial questions, a sincere interest in honest government, and a thoroughly southern point of view. Due to Kendall's reports from the fighting front the *Picayune* became and remains a chief source of contemporary information on the Mexican War.

It dared feature local news, when such news was held "picayunish," exposed sham, condemned robber-banking, cursed the *code duello* as barbarous, promoted the public school system as a popular responsibility when its opponents found it socialistic and tinged with indigency, urged temperance in a community given to the julep and the cobbler, crusaded against imprisonment for debt, accepted secession when it became a fact, urged conciliation during Butler's regime and the loathsome reconstruction era, opposed woman suffrage in its early days, accepted the lottery for the good it accomplished, and supported Boss Long in those early years during which he and Father Coughlin supported President Roosevelt. The *Picayune* was the first great daily to have a woman publisher, and it was nonetheless successful for that.

From this mine of social information, Mr. Dabney offers pictures of life in New Orleans about 1840, during the Civil War era (Mr. Beard's "Second Revolutionary War"), in the 1890's, and under Huey Long's dictatorship. Through the book run the names of businessmen, writers, actors, bankers, prize fighters, and madames from Storytown. Not always critical and not always liberal, the work is at all times interesting and illuminating.

There are some items of special note for Catholic readers: the celebrations of the Battle of New Orleans, in 1840, when Jackson attended St. Louis Cathedral and in 1915; Kendall's reports on France in 1848 and 1852, Kossuth in New Orleans, the defeat of P. G. T. Beauregard for mayor by the Know-Nothings, John McDonogh's bequest of a million dollars for the public schools, Father Maistre's alleged incitement of blacks against whites, Father Napoleon Perché's arrest by Ben Butler who suppressed his secessionist *Le Propagateur Catholique* (recalling suppression of the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore and the *Freeman's Journal* of New York), Father Mullen's defiance of "Spoon or Beast" Butler (to the citizens under the occupation), the militarism of General Sheridan, the organization of the White Camelia by Judge Alcibiade de Blanc, the political corruption of E. A. Burke whose religion, if any, is not noted, the philanthropies of remarkable Margaret Haughery, the Italian society's honors for Garibaldi, Italy's bold bluff in the Mafia lynchings for the murder of Police Chief Hennessy, the election of Mayor Andrew McShane, the Ku Klux Klan pictured in its most favorable light, and Loyola University's honorary degree to Huey Long, corruptionist and share-the-wealth demagogue in the best socialist style of championing the forgotten masses.

RICHARD J. PURCELL

The Catholic University of America

Durable Peace. A Study in National Policy. By ROSS J. S. HOFFMAN. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1944. Pp. vii, 120. $1.75)

This is the book of an American scholar who works in the grand style, using his knowledge of the past to recognize the present and to discern the future. The times call for an historian of this kind.

The American idea has always had within it the anticipation that eventually this country would play a great role in human affairs. Nothing could be more alien to the minds of the founders of the Republic or to their spiritual successors than the notion that America had seceded from the civilization in which it originated, was in permanent rebellion against it, and was destined to create something new and altogether different. The true American tradition is, on the contrary, that in the New World the ancient and universal ideals of man and of society were to be realized under more favorable conditions, and that somehow this promise was the concern of all mankind.

But for about a century this country developed on the frontier of the civilization of which it partakes. The periphery was far from the center. In our own generation America has become a central and principal power, and now Americans, who used to read about history, find themselves making it. They will read history with a new seriousness, looking for wisdom to guide them. Apart from, and, the reviewer thinks, above the specific conclusions, they can find in Professor Hoffman's book an elegant example of how wisdom, which is humane, shrewd, and magnanimous, is distilled from the study of history.

The reviewer does not think he is deceiving himself into admiring so profoundly the quality of this work because in all essentials he agrees so thoroughly with its conclusions. But he does take great comfort in the fact that by a very different method of inquiry and of reasoning the author and himself should have reached substantially the same conclusions as to how this war is to be settled and about the part which the United States is destined to play.

Professor Hoffman sets this war in its place within the history of Christendom and of western civilization, and in this setting he recognizes that there is emerging a western community, the heir of Rome, wherein the United States is now a leading member, and a Eurasian community, the heir of Byzantium, wherein the U.S.S.R. is the leading member. Having recognized these historic formations, he discerns that the shape of the near future will be determined by their antagonism or their gradually increasing collaboration.

Starting from a wholly different consideration — namely, how to make the United States secure in its strategic position as a continental island, the reviewer found himself recognizing first the military necessity and then the historic significance of the Atlantic community, which is the heir of Rome and the progeny of western Christendom, and of its necessary relationship with the eastern community.

Thus we have been like two men burrowing from different sides of the mountain who find that they have arrived at the same place. This makes me think that these conclusions must reflect, however imperfectly, the nature of things, and not our personal whims and wishes.

The event will tell. We are only at the beginning of the road, but no one who takes it will find a better guide and companion for the journey than this deeply civilized book.

WALTER LIPPMANN

Washington, D. C.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Committee on Program for the silver jubilee meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association to be held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, December 28-29, 1944, is working out details of the program which, it is hoped, may be completed by the time this issue of the REVIEW is in the hands of the members. The committee is headed by George F. Donovan, President of Webster College, as chairman, with the Reverend Clarence J. Ryan, S.J., of Marquette University and Elizabeth M. Lynskey of Hunter College as members. In accordance with the policy adopted by the Association in Chicago in 1940, the coming meeting will be held to four sessions: a general session with two papers on Thursday, December 28, at 10 A. M., the business session at 4 P. M., on Thursday, the joint session with the American Historical Association on Friday, December 29, at 10 A. M., and the silver jubilee luncheon conference on Friday at 12:30 P. M. The Committee on Program has arranged an attractive group of papers and speakers, and it is to be hoped that as many members as possible will be on hand to help celebrate the close of the Association's first quarter century. The Local Arrangements Committee, of which Professor Paul Kiniery of Loyola University is chairman, is carrying out details with officials of the Stevens and representatives of the Association in the universities, colleges, and seminaries of the Chicago area.

The silver jubilee of the American Catholic Historical Association will likewise be commemorated in the publication this autumn of the second volume of its series of diplomatic documents, a work edited by the chairman of the Committee on Publications, Leo F. Stock, and by an article reviewing the history of the Association by John K. Cartwright, Treasurer for the past twelve years, which will appear in the January, 1945, issue of the REVIEW.

In view of the proposed discussion of Americanism at the December meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association the following note and letter sent by Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., archivist of the University of Notre Dame, will be of interest. The letter of Cardinal Gibbons was made available by Monsignor Joseph M. Nelligan, chancellor of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington.

In his apostolic letter, *Testem Benevolentiae,* of January 22, 1899, addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, Pope Leo XIII condemned the heresy of

Americanism. Answering letters from American archbishops and bishops to the Holy Father agreed in their acceptance of the condemnation, but they differed widely on the question of existence of the formal heresy in the United States. Many of these answers were published both here and abroad. Cardinal Gibbons' answer to the Holy Father was never published. Probably the sharpness of the controversy that developed between American groups about the application of the condemnation to certain American prelates prevented His Eminence from giving the letter to the public. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the London *Tablet*, and several American periodicals published the letters of Archbishop Ireland of Saint Paul, Archbishop Corrigan of New York, and of other prelates but not of the Baltimore prelate. Even Allen Will, biographer of the cardinal, apparently did not see his answer. The document has its importance in the historical discussion of the famous controversy.

March 17, 1899.

Très Saint Père:

La lettre par laquelle V. S. réprouve les erreurs que certains personnages ont représentées par le nom d'Américanisme, m'est parvenue vers le milieu du mois de février. J'en ai fait faire une traduction anglaise que j'ai publiée en même temps que le texte latin.

Mes sentiments sont trop bien connus de V. S. pour que j'aie besoin de lui dire que de tout mon coeur je la remercie d'avoir fait la lumière sur toutes ces questions, qu'en dehors des Etats Unis, certains esprits paraissaient prendre plaisir à embrouiller depuis un an, mais qui chez nous n'occupaient en rien l'opinion publique.

Cette doctrine que j'appellerais volontiers extravagante et absurde, cet Américanisme, comme on a bien voulu l'appeler, n'a rien de commun avec les vues, les aspirations, les doctrines et la conduite des Américains. Je ne pense pas que, dans tout le pays, on put trouver un évêque, un prêtre, ou même un laique instruit de sa religion, qui ait jamais mis en avant de pareilles énormités. Non, ce n'est pas là, ce n'a jamais été et ce ne sera jamais notre Américanisme. Je suis profondément reconnaissant à V. S. d'avoir, dans la lettre apostolique, fait elle même cette distinction.

Mon désir était d'écrire immédiatement à V. S. pour la remercier de ce nouvel acte de bienveillance à notre égard; mais j'ai préféré attendre, afin de me rendre compte de l'effet que le Document Pontifical produirait sur l'esprit public et en particulier sur les Catholiques Américains.

Je suis heureux, très-Saint Père, de pouvoir dire à V. S. que les sentiments qui se sont manifestés, mêlés à un certain étonnement qu'on ait pu attribuer aux Catholiques Américains, de pareilles doctrines, ont été ceux du respect le plus profond pour la parole pontificale, de vive reconnaissance pour la bienveillance que vous nous temoignez, et de sincère appréciation de la distinction que V. S. fait si justement entre les doctrines que nous réprouvons avec Elle, et ces sentiments d'amour pour notre pays et ses institutions que nous partageons avec nos concitoyens, et qui nous sont d'un si puissant secours dans l'oeuvre que nous avons à accomplir pour la gloire de Dieu et l'honneur de la Sainte Eglise.

C'est avec le plus profond respect, etc.

JAMES CARD. GIBBONS

One of the most fruitful sources of Catholic history in the United States is the pastoral letter. Outside of Guilday's collection of the national pastorals, only a few of these documents have been published, although the number of such pastorals is large enough to fill a considerable library. Besides discussing diocesan regulations and urging the fulfillment of ordinary church obligations, these pastorals contain important discussions of contemporary problems about education, social reform, panics, and schismatic troubles. In so far as these letters were usually sent out to pastors and missionaries, who seldom preserved them, very few complete files of any of the early bishops' pastorals are extant. The library of the University of Notre Dame is endeavoring to complete its large collection of these pastorals, using photostats where originals cannot be obtained. It is desirable that some energetic students of American Catholic history prepare a catalog of these important documents. They will be very useful in answering pertinent questions about the bishops' attitude on the important religious questions of the day.

Because the life of James Farnham Edwards, the founder of the Archives and Historical Museum at the University of Notre Dame, has not as yet been written, his acquisition of so many priceless documents and relics is not easily understood today, when manuscript materials are so carefully guarded. Only those who are acquainted with the sacrifices he made and with his persistence in begging can appreciate the labors that made possible his collection. A recently discovered diary of Mr. Edwards tells of one of his journeys to the households of the Archbishops of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore and his friendly contacts with most of the hierarchy of the 1890's. Besides collecting manuscripts and relics, on this occasion he took with him the artist, Paul Wood, who painted many of the portraits of the Bishops' Memorial Gallery at Notre Dame. Mr. Edwards notes that he himself did some of the painting!

The Archives of the University of Notre Dame has recently received photostats of twelve documents dealing with the career of Archbishop John Lamy of Santa Fe, the historical reality of Willa Cather's *Death Comes to the Archbishop*. The originals of these manuscripts were obtained by the late Archbishop Rudolph A. Gerken from Mexico shortly before his death, and copies were presented to the University by Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne, his successor. The collection of the material written by Archbishop Lamy at Notre Dame contains Lamy letters from the time of his ordination up to and including his resignation as Archbishop of Santa Fe on July 18, 1885.

Any serious study made regarding the Catholic population of the United States is of interest to the church historian, for everyone having to treat of population trends has been plagued with the uncertainty accompanying the estimates carried in the *Catholic Directory*. For that reason church historians will welcome the study made by George A. Kelly and Thomas Coogan on the Catholic population of the United States in 1940 embodied in their article, "What Is Our Real Catholic Population?" in the May, 1944, issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. Fathers Kelly and Coogan have arrived at the figure of 30,000,000 Catholics for the population of that year, and they have shown through analysis of the birth rate and death rate of Catholics that the estimate of approximately 22,000,000 of the *Directory* for 1940 was too low. Doubtless the authors would be the last to claim finality for their study, but at least a good beginning has been made to point the way for a rectification of the inaccurate estimates of the Catholic population carried each year by the *Directory* in the case of some areas.

The Most Reverend John A. Duffy, Bishop of Buffalo, has recently appointed a committee of priests to comprise the Historical Commission of the Diocese of Buffalo. They are the Reverends C. George Zimpfer, Martin H. Ebner, and Edward S. Schwegler. The Commission is charged with gathering the historical data of the diocese, which was established by the bull, *Universi dominici,* of Pius IX on April 23, 1847, and which will soon be celebrating its centenary.

Catholic historians whose interests run along sociological and economic lines will be interested in the establishment of the Institute of Social Sciences at St. Louis University. The Institute is a co-operative venture of the fourteen universities and eleven colleges of the Society of Jesus in the United States.

The Society of American Archivists has appointed a committee on industrial archives which has for its concern the manuscripts and papers belonging to religious, educational, and business institutions. Miss Margaret Norton has appointed Walter Hausdorfer of the School of Business of Columbia University as chairman of the committee. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., of the Archives of the University of Notre Dame, is the Catholic member of the committee, and he is making a survey of Catholic archival deposits.

The Cleveland Public Library is sponsoring a new organization to be known as the Great Lakes Historical Society. Objectives will be: discovery and preservation of material on the Great Lakes area, centralization of information about such collections, an inclusive finding-list of materials on Great Lakes history, and the publication of a magazine.

The Department of Documents of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society is taking an inventory of and cataloguing a large amount of materials hitherto neglected. To date some 300 items have been inventoried and are available for research. They include such interesting documents as a letter from Brigadier General John H. Morgan, Confederate cavalry leader, written in behalf of John H. Null, a Union private. Null, one of Morgan's guards in the Ohio penitentiary, treated the Southern leader "with great courtesy and kindness." The letter asks that if Null should ever be captured, he should be treated with all consideration. The Confederates, who captured Null shortly after this letter was written, paroled him after seven weeks.

The newspaper department of this same Society has made a thorough survey of all Ohio newspapers, thus giving it the most accurate and up-to-date record of Ohio newspapers available. Returns from every library in the state are now being indexed.

Historians will be among the first to appreciate the value of the microcard method of reproducing books. Fremont Rider describes his, what promises to be revolutionary, invention in a volume just off the press. The book is reviewed elsewhere in this issue. It will not be necessary to point out the possibilities that the new system can open up for the study of history.

The outstanding contribution to the June number of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia is Leo F. Stock's article, "The Papal Consuls of Philadelphia." It is a carefully-documented study such as scholars have come to expect from the author. Dr. Stock was made an honorary member of the Philadelphia Society this year.

During the past summer Thomas F. O'Connor, historiographer of the Archdiocese of New York, delivered two series of lectures to the seminarians of the Diocese of Buffalo at Our Lady of the Lake, Diocesan House of Studies, Bemus Point, New York. Mr. O'Connor's lectures dealt with the history of the ecclesiastical province of New York.

Father Charles H. Metzger, S.J., is burrowing into an interesting, untouched phase of the American Revolution, namely, the Catholic Tory troops. To date, he has unearthed a promising amount of material, but he will greatly appreciate any helpful information from our readers.

The Catholic Mind for June, 1944, runs a reprint of Father Joseph B. Schuyer's excellent article on Father Heinrich Pesch, S.J. Father Pesch is hailed as the originator of the philosophy and political economy called Christian Solidarism.

A chapel, donated by Herman G. Hetzler of Rochester, was recently dedicated at Cape St. Vincent, New York, to commemorate the landing of Claude Dablon, S.J. on March 19, 1656.

An interesting account of the history of Lake Superior is to be found in Grace Lee Nute's recently published *Lake Superior*. Beginning with the canoes of the Indians, this saga of our greatest inland sea carries the reader through the era of small boats, schooners, and steamers, telling of the fortunes made from iron and copper discovered near its shores and of the wealth amassed by the lumber kings.

The sophomore girls of Sacred Heart High School, Pittsburgh, working under the direction of the Reverend Thomas F. Coakley, pastor, and their English instructor, Sister Mary Zoe, have written an attractive brochure entitled, *History of Sacred Heart Parish, Pittsburgh, 1872-1944*. This parish, which possesses an unusually fine church, was begun in Pittsburgh's East End in August, 1872. In its history of seventy-two years it has had but three pastors. All phases of parish life have been covered in the brochure and the compilation of data will prove of real service when some future historian undertakes to write the history of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

The Lincoln National Life Foundation of Fort Wayne, Indiana, which publishes a weekly bulletin entitled, *Lincoln Lore,* devoted its single-page issue of May 29 to the subject of "President Lincoln's Interest in Catholic Institutions." That interest was manifested by a note of January 17, 1865, to the mother superior of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky, assuring her that the army commanders had been ordered not to disturb their properties. The bulletin further notes that Zachariah Riney, who was Lincoln's first teacher when the family lived near present-day Athertonville, Kentucky, came to the Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani in 1856 and remained there for a little over two years until his death in 1859. Riney was buried on the property of the Trappist monastery, although there is no marker to indicate the whereabouts of his remains.

Since 1940 the students of Marygrove College, Detroit, have been issuing an annual volume of essays on some central theme of importance in Catholic thought. Their 1944 issue is devoted to a series of twenty-four brief essays on the history of the Catholic Church in the United States, entitled, *Saga of Service*. This is the sort of thing that will awaken the intelligent interest of our college students in the Church's American story, as it will likewise reflect credit on the able direction given by the students' professors in history at the Detroit institution.

The sixth in the series of National Archives *Bulletins* is the recently published *Buildings and Equipment for Archives.* The three papers that comprise this *Bulletin* were read at the seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists. It contains much of interest to those concerned with the adequate housing of records, particularly with reference to post-war building programs. Copies may be obtained from the Assistant Administrative Secretary of the National Archives.

Since the issue of July 8 *America* is appearing in a new format. Restrictions on paper have cut the size of the magazine from thirty-two pages to twenty-four, but with a new arrangement of materials the editors are able to present 90 per cent of the content of their former issue.

The *Report, 1942-1943* of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association closes the first decade of life of our sister society. The current volume contains the proceedings, reports of the officers, and the texts of the fourteen papers delivered in both the English and French sections of the Association at the tenth annual meeting in Hamilton, Ontario, September 22-23, 1943. The Association is steadily growing, the English section secretary reporting a membership of nearly 400. The present *Report* likewise carries an index of these annual volumes covering the years, 1934-1943.

The editors of the REVIEW are happy to greet *The Americas,* the journal of the Academy of American Franciscan History, the original issue of which appeared in July. The rich contents of this first number augur well for the success of the new venture. The articles, notes, and reviews are, of course, devoted predominantly, as was intended, to Latin American and Franciscan themes. The articles are listed in our section on Periodical Literature.

The REVIEW hails the appearance at Buenos Aires of *El digesto católico,* the South American edition of the *Catholic Digest.* We venture to say that it will do much to explain our North American way to the Spanish-speaking peoples of the hemisphere.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies was recently held in Washington to discuss a report on research in Ibero-American subjects prepared under the direction of Colonel Preston James, on leave from the University of Michigan.

Professor Lawrence E. Hill, of Ohio State University, is editing the volume on Brazil for the United Nations Series which the University of California Press is issuing.

Under the direction of Professor William Berrien, formerly of the Rockefeller Foundation and now of Harvard University, a handbook of Brazilian studies, to which American and Brazilian scholars have contributed, will be published in the near future by the Instituto Nacional do Livro of Rio de Janeiro.

No. 3 of the series: Mediaeval Philosophical Texts in Translation, published by Marquette University Press, is a translation of Pico della Mirandola's *De ente et uno* by Victor Michael Hamm. Only such of our readers as are especially interested in philosophy will care to read the translation of this little work. The very satisfactory English version with its notes was facilitated by the French of Father A. J. Festugière. Professor Hamm's twelve-page introduction has more appeal for the historian. It presents and evaluates considerable bibiliography on Pico, but offers little or no new information concerning him. Interesting excerpts from a letter of Pico in defence of scholasticism are given in translation.

The Cardinal Hayes Library of Manhattan College has recently received a sixteenth-century English manuscript containing St. Thomas More's work on the Blessed Sacrament. The manuscript was presented by Paolino Gerli, who purchased it at the auction of the John Burns Library held in England last spring. Brother Augustine Philip, F.S.C., of Manhattan College, will edit a critical edition of the work.

A number of seventeenth-century broadsides in the possession of the Maryland Historical Society deal with controversies between Catholics and Protestants in England.

The Cleveland Public Library is continually enlarging its collection of material on the Titus Oates Plot and on the Jacobites. This material can hardly be neglected by students in these two fields.

In the reorganization of the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, Philip S. Moore, C.S.C., has been named dean. Father Moore is an ancien élève of the Ecole des Chartes and has a Ph.D. in philosophy from the Catholic University of America. His special field is the history of scholasticism. He is the editor of Notre Dame University's Publications in Mediaeval Studies and has himself made three important contributions to the series.

Demetrius B. Zema, S.J., head of the department of history at Fordham University, has been appointed rector of Our Lady of Martyrs Tertianship, Auriesville, New York. Professor Ross J. S. Hoffman succeeds Father Zema as head of the department.

Ray A. Billington of Smith College, known to readers of the REVIEW for his excellent volume, *The Protestant Crusade* (New York, 1938), has been appointed professor of American history at Northwestern University.

J. Manuel Espinosa of Loyola University, Chicago, has accepted a position in the Division of Cultural Cooperation in the Department of State.

W. Eugene Shields, S.J., formerly of the staff of *America,* has been appointed to the Department of History of the University of Detroit.

Charles C. Tansill of Fordham University has been appointed professor of American history at Georgetown University.

Peter J. Dunne, S.J., chairman of the department of history, University of San Francisco, has recently returned from an extended trip through Latin America.

Philip Powell, who taught Ibero-American history at the University of Pennsylvania during the past year, has accepted a post at Northwestern University, where he will fill the place made vacant by the resignation of James F. King, who is now at the University of California, Berkeley.

The opening of another academic year will see the departure from Washington of a number of scholars in the field of Ibero-American history. J. Lloyd Mecham, of the University of Texas, who has been serving in the Department of State, will leave for Austin in October. Arthur P. Whitaker has already resumed his teaching duties at the University of Pennsylvania, but he will continue in a consultative capacity with the Department of State.

Gilberto Freyre, whose studies on Brazilian social history are well known, and whose book, *Casa Grande & Senzala,* is to be published in English translation by Alfred A. Knopf, will teach and lecture at Indiana University until December.

Dr. José María Chacón y Calvo, the distinguished Director de Cultura of Cuba, was a recent visitor to the United States.

The historian of the Diocese of Richmond, F. Joseph Magri, died on June 6. Monsignor Magri was a life member of the American Catholic Historical Association. He was the author of *The Catholic Church in the City and Diocese of Richmond* (Richmond, 1906).

The tercentenary of the death of the Irish historian, Brother Michael O'Cleirigh, O.F.M., chief of the Four Masters, has been celebrated in Ireland this year. Elaborate ceremonies were held in Dublin in July.

The 125th anniversary of St. Augustine's Chapel, Boston, was commemorated on July 4. The chapel was blessed on July 4, 1819 by Bishop

Cheverus. The cemetery surrounding the all-brick structure contains the remains of many notables in Boston's Catholic history, François A. Matignon, Patrick Donahoe, editor for many years of *The Pilot,* Mrs. Charles Seton, sister-in-law of Mother Seton, and the parents of Archbishop Williams.

The Church of St. Francis of Assisi, New York, is observing its centenary, October 4-8.

The centenary of the arrival of the Grey Nuns in Western Canada was celebrated at St. Boniface, Manitoba, in July.

This year marks the first centenary of the Apostleship of Prayer.

At Westphalia, Iowa, a Catholic rural co-operative rally will be held October 7-8 to commemorate the centennial of the Rochdale Co-operative.

The centenary of the death of Brother Edmund Ignatius Rice, founder of the Irish Christian Brothers, is being observed this year.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference completed its first twenty-five years of splendid service on September 24.

Documents: Ezechiel Sangmeister's Diary. Felix Reichmann (*Penna. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.,* July).—Two letters, one from Bishop Henni to Archbishop Reisach, the other from Reverend Michael Heiss to the Board of Directors of the Ludwigmissionsverein, Munich. Peter Leo Johnson (Ed.) (*Salesianum,* July).—Letter of the First Bishops of Mexico and Oaxaca, 1537. France V. Scholes, ed. (*Americas,* July).—Another Letter of the Same, 1537. *Idem* (*ibid.*)—Relacion of the Bishop of Santo Domingo, c. 1537. *Idem* (*ibid.*).

BRIEF NOTICES

Adams, Henry Hitch. *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642.* [Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 159.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. xii, 228. $2.50.) This dissertation consists chiefly of a definition and classification of those tragedies of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries which departed from the norm of classical tragedy by employing plots centered about the "common man" as hero. The resultant dramas were those of the common people "dealing with personal and family relationships rather than with large affairs of state, presented in a realistic fashion, and ending in a tragic or otherwise serious manner." The author is careful to point out that the word "domestic" in his definition connotes the familiar and local, the common, not necessarily or only those incidents or stories which have their source in family life. The bulk of the study, however, is given over to demonstrating from sources, from analogous contemporary literature, chiefly moral and theological, and through detailed analyses of the plays, that the major characteristic of the tragedy of the common man was its homiletic intent. While the relation between the plots and characters of the domestic tragedies to the broadside ballads is noted, it is not explored. It would seem of almost equal importance. The broadsides were, within their scope, as moral and theological as the domestic tragedies. The incidents related in both were timely and sensational, equivalent to today's latest scandal of infidelity or murder, and their strength and weakness lay in their very timeliness and sensationalism. With few exceptions, the domestic tragedies are remarkable neither for poetic excellence nor dramatic structure. They suffer not only from "moral overemphasis" but from hasty writing. The 'abstract and brief records of the time', it was necessary for most of them to reach the boards before interest in the story cooled. It is significant that except for *A Yorkshire Tragedy,* the better plays of this type, such as *'Tis a Pity She's a Whore* and *A Woman Killed with Kindness,* were not based immediately on contemporary incidents.

On the whole, the essay is informative and the conclusions sound. One might question the author's interpretation of the Elizabethan concept of the distinction between venial and mortal sin. It is doubtful whether the most Calvinistic of theologians considered all mortal sins, even those "in which the mind had been perverted to evil courses" as unforgivable. Why, then, did the heros and heroines of the domestic tragedies make the almost inevitable deathbed or scaffold confessions? (Sister M. Emmanuel Collins)

Bailly, Auguste. *Richelieu.* (Paris: A. Fayard et Cie. Distributed by Les Éditions Variétés. Montreal. 1943. Pp. 346. $1.25.) Why another life of Richelieu? The author explains: "Posterity has not been fair with him. Because of his unbending authority, his rigor, his spy system, because of the methods he used in condemning his enemies, writers have delineated him as a kind of legendary figure, demoniacal and repulsive. These melodramatic portrayals are false and puerile. Richelieu was neither a devil nor a god; he was simply a great man, in fact one of the greatest men that western civilization has produced. Richelieu envisaged clearly the task which he had to perform and in the fulfillment of that job, he used the extraordinary intelligence with which nature had endowed him plus the imagination which such men need. His objective well defined, all obstacles, no matter how difficult or recalcitrant, had to be beaten down. It was not tyranny, it was not cruelty that prompted him to do what he did. If he had not been inexorable, his enemies and the enemies of France, would have taken advantage of his weakness" (p. 306).

The author has said enough in these few lines to give the reader an indication of what he wants to do in this book. It is Richelieu vindicated, Richelieu rehabilitated before mankind. He makes out a good case, but, unfortunately, we have to take his word for it. There are no sources quoted, no bibliography given, no authorities cited. Richelieu's motto could well have been that of our modern dictators. "Tout pour l'état, rien contre l'état." This is the motto of Hitler and others of the type. One almost feels that if he accepts Bailly's interpretation that he would at the same time be accepting the teachings of Machiavelli. When he was asked on his deathbed whether or not he forgave his enemies his answer was, "The only enemies I have had are the enemies of the state."

The book is completely bereft of bibliography, index, illustrations, or maps. It is well-written and interesting, but M. Bailly seems to take as his motto *De mortuis nil nisi bonum,* a dangerous motto for the historian. The work lacks historical balance. (EDWARD V. CARDINAL)

DUBS, HOMER H. (Ed. and Trans.). *The History of the Former Han Dynasty by Pan Ku.* Translation, First Division, The Imperial Annals, Chapters I-V and VI-X. A Critical Translation with Annotations, with the Collaboration of Jen T'ai and P'an Lo-Chi. 2 Volumes. (Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies. 1938, 1944. Pp. xiii, 339; ix, 426. $4.50.) *Quarterly Bulletin of Chinese Bibliography.* (English Edition) N. S. II, 1-2 (June, 1941); N. S. III, 1-2 (March-June, 1943). (Hong Kong: Chinese National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the National Library of Peiping. 1943. Pp. 112, vi, 94. $1.50.) It was in 202 B.C. that Kao-tsu became emperor. The Chinese world was still largely the area of the Yellow River but the significance of the event was to be great for the next two thousand years of greater empire. For the first time the ancient aristocracy was humbled, and imperial authority submitted to the Confucian precept that a ruler must claim power only for the advantage of the people. "When the Han dynasty arose, it swept away vexations and harshness and gave the common people repose and rest" (5:1ob). It was, therefore, sort of at the beginning of things that the Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies for the Promotion of Chinese Studies began its ambitious plan to make available in translation a vast *Bibliotheca Sinica.* Some idea of the magnitude of the undertaking is suggested by the fact that these two volumes, and a third which will complete the twelfth and final chapter of the Annals, is the mere chronological outline, or about one-sixteenth of the whole work of Pan Ku. With elaborate annotations already provided, they will be further buttressed by two other volumes, one of prolegomena and the other of glossary. This is but the first of a series of works the object of which is nothing less than to provide the English-speaking world with a body of material for Oriental studies comparable to the Loeb Classical Library.

These two issues of the *Quarterly Bulletin* offer a contrast, not so much in intellectual output as in points which follow from their respective dates. That of June, 1941, reflects the relative ease with which Chungking retained communication through Shanghai and Hong Kong with the rest of the world outside the Japanese sphere. The issue of March-June, 1943, comes straight from Chungking, has a poor print, is listed in Chinese dollars at about thirty times the subscription price of the earlier issue, but manages to have a remarkably high grade of articles, notes, and progress reports on Chinese institutions. (JOHN T. FARRELL)

GOODRICH, LELAND M. and MARIE J. CARROLL (Eds.) *Documents on American Foreign Relations.* Volume V, *July 1942-June 1943.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1944. Pp. xxxv, 735. $3.75.) The fifth volume of *Documents on American Foreign Relations,* published by the World Peace Foundation, should receive a ready welcome from teachers and students of contemporary history as a timely and well-edited compilation of source material on a diplomatic-fiscal year without parallel in our national life. The aim of the editors, as stated in 1939, was to make available in a series of annual volumes documentary materials of American foreign relations when these materials are of immediate interest to students in college courses in diplomatic history, political science, and international relations. The increasing excellence of each succeeding volume of the series indicates that this aim is being realized.

The year covered by this volume was one of historic conferences and meetings dealing with the military front, on which the United Nations passed from defensive to offensive, and with international relations, in which a start was made toward increased co-operation in dealing with problems of the post-war world. The value of this volume for the scholar is enhanced by the inclusion, in whole or in excerpt, of the documents dealing with Reciprocal Lend-Lease, Relief and Rehabilitation, the Casablanca Conference, and the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, all of which will be the subject of study for years to come.

The organization of materials follows the scheme of earlier volumes, under a three-part arrangement of Principles and Policy; Defense and the War Effort, Axis Powers, and United Nations; and foreign relations with individual nations, arranged by geographical areas. The typography and the index leave nothing to be desired, and the headnotes are on the whole, excellent. It should be noted, however, in connection with the origin of "unconditional surrender," that it is inaccurate to state that it was borrowed from "a phrase from a letter of General Grant to the Confederate Commander of Forts Henry and Donelson during the American Civil War" (p. 209). (ALLAN J. DOHERTY)

GRAGG, FLORENCE ALDEN (Trans.) *The Commentaries of Pius II.* Books II and III. With Historical Introduction and Notes by LEONA C. GABEL. (Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Studies in History, Volume XXV, Nos. 1-4, October, 1939-July, 1940. Pp. 115-291. $2.00.) The first installment of this work received a notice in the *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVI (October, 1940), 403. This second installment contains a translation, with notes, of Books II and III of Aeneas' *Commentaries*. The translation reads smoothly and seems accurate. It cannot be checked satisfactorily, however, until the editors publish a new edition of the Latin text based on the Vatican Manuscript, as they have promised. The historical notes are brief, but adequate. To the bibliography should now be added the monograph of Brother Joel Stanislaus Nelson, *Aeneas Silvii De Liberorum Educatione, A Translation, with an Introduction*. The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Volume XII (Washington, 1940). (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

GWYNN, DENIS. *The Second Spring, 1818-1852: A Study of the Catholic Revival in England.* (London: Burns Oates. 1942. Pp. ix, 246. 9/-. $2.50.) Mr. Gwynn succeeds in reducing to a single volume a story which previously had been told only in sections by many authors in many different works. The "various threads in a complicated story" have been traced in this continuous and well-integrated narrative. It is a digest of a glorious chapter in English Catholicism enhanced by a judicious choice of details in the lives of the important individuals and the events in which they figured.

The year 1818 marked the time when six youths, including Nicholas Wiseman, left England to study in Rome as students at the English College. This college had been evacuated during the Napoleonic wars and these students were the first group to re-settle in its precincts. Such an event Mr. Gwynn sees as a climax following on the re-opening, begun in 1793, of the Catholic schools in England which for so long had been established on the continent. In 1852 there was witnessed the first synod in England after the restoration of the hierarchy. These two dates, overlapping the Oxford Movement, though somewhat arbitrary as must be the dates confining any broad movement, seem to the author significant limits within which to include his synthesis.

Mr. Gwynn resurrects from relative obscurity the prominent part played in the revival by Ambrose Phillipps and George Spencer — both converts from Cambridge — and the not less prominent part played by their associates whom they influenced and encouraged — Augustus Welby Pugin, Lord Shrewsbury, and Dominic Barberi. These men all expended personal energy; Phillipps, Spencer, and Shrewsbury being men of some wealth, expended besides a great deal of money, erecting churches and establishing missions. While these leaders continued to point the way among the general populace, the Oxford Movement became effective among educated Englishmen. Its gradual effects on the men at Littlemore, centered around Newman's capitulation which was symbolized by the grey trousers episode; the story of Manning's leave-taking of Gladstone at the communion service in the Church of England with his subsequent conversion and rapid advancement to ordination; Ward's publication of the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, which led to his degradation at Oxford — these and many other striking details demonstrate the author's sense of the dramatic in describing the Oxford Movement, called by Phillipps "the brightest symptom of England's re-conversion."

A fuller index as well as a bibliography would have added usefulness to this excellent work; and although the sources are almost entirely secondary, the author has bountifully re-quoted original documents cited in them. The reviewer has noted several minor errors. The Archbishop of Baltimore is referred to as the primate of the American hierarchy, a title he never enjoyed (p. 42). Closer reading of the manuscript would have obviated two other errors, the misspelling of Bishop Baines' name (p. 76) and the incorrect numerical identity for Gregory XVI (p. 175). (Joseph P. Bradley)

Le Roy, Loys. *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers.* Selections with an Introduction by Blanchard W. Bates. (Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xvii, 54. 50¢); Montesquieu. *Extraits sur la loi, la liberté et le gouvernement anglais.* With an Introductory Essay by Roger B. Oak. (Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xiii, 46. 50¢.); H. Taine. *Introduction à l'Histoire de la Littérature anglaise.* Avec des remarques préliminaires par Gilbert Chinard. (Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xix 29. 50¢); Ernest Renan. *Les sciences de la nature et les sciences historiques.* (Lettre *à Marcellin Berthelot*) *& L'avenir de la science.* (*Chapitres II et XVI*). With an Introduction by Ira O. Wade. (Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xxi, 43. 50¢.) Elegantly printed and sold at a moderate price, these brochures are the first of a series of Princeton Texts in Literature and the History of Thought edited by the Romance Section of the Advisory Council of the Department of Modern Languages and Literature of Princeton University. The object of the series is to make available in a convenient form texts that are essential, or at least important, for the study of literature and of the history of thought. They are only selections, but they will give the student a preliminary introduction to the thought of authors who have left their imprint on the evolution of literature, philosophy, and history. Some of these authors, such as Montesquieu, Taine, and Renan, are classic and still may be mere names for the average reader. Even a few pages of their works will be enough to reveal the real trend of their thought and stimulate the desire for further reading. Others, like Loys Le Roy, may be known only to specialists, and yet merit to be brought out of oblivion if their work is of the quality of *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers.* In the words of a critic, Le Roy "may be considered as the creator of the history of civilization, and, in many respects, of the modern conception of history." The distinction of the editors is sufficient guarantee of the merits of the series, and the scholarly introductions to the several selections enhance their value. It is greatly to be hoped that its success will not be hampered by the present difficulties. (Jules A. Baisnée)

Peers, E. Allison. *Spirit of Flame. A Study of St. John of the Cross.* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co. 1944. Pp. xiii, 214. $2.00.) *Spirit of Flame* is one of those rare books whose writing was in every way justified. Written by an expert " . . . after a quarter of a century spent in ever-increasing intimacy with his thought," it is meant as an introduction " . . . . for readers now meeting St. John of the Cross for the first time . . . . who have neither the time nor the training to study the three large volumes of the *Works*." Yet it is likewise of great value to advanced students of the saint because it is a classic summary of his life and teachings.

The first half is biographical — the work of a master in its choice of details and the understanding appreciation that can weave them into a delightful portrait of the human side of a saint. Part two sketches the unique features in the *Doctor Mysticus,* his poetry, his audience, five objections to his doctrines and their answers, and, finally, the attractiveness of his system.

The chapter on "The Poets' Poet," is the least convincing — not that St. John of the Cross does not deserve the title, for it has been elsewhere conceded to him in Spanish literature — but many of those who have treated this aspect of the saint's writings were either not versed in mystical theology or were not capable critics of the structure of Spanish poetry, and one must be both to give a just opinion of the literary merit of John of the Cross. Fortunately, Professor Peers has the necessary qualifications, but the same cannot be said for some of the others he quotes.

Of the objections treated, the first is most practical: " . . . . the apparent divergence of the mystic's standards from those of Christ and the Gospels." The answer given is spiritually stimulating:

> The difference between the popular attitude to the 'hard sayings' of Our Lord and to those of St. John of the Cross is that the former, having been uttered nearly two thousand years ago to an Eastern people, are taken as being figurative and either diluted, or discounted, or simply disregarded altogether, whereas the latter, being less than four hundred years old and belonging to our own Western civilization, cannot be so easily passed over (p. 182).

If anything is to be desired in the second part, perhaps it is a more explicit picture of the ultimate goal of the mystical way; that alone can make one risk the dangers of the journey described here so vividly, and its foretaste is what helps one most to persevere in its quest. (NORMAN G. WERLING)

SHAW, ALBERT. *International Bearings of American Policy.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943. Pp. x, 492. $3.50.) As a close observer, commentator, and participant in world affairs for over a half century, Dr. Albert Shaw has given us an account of America's role as a member of the world of nations which is a mixture of personal reminiscences, scholarship, and crusading zeal for a stronger League of Nations built around Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. Dr. Shaw sees the logic of the history of American foreign relations making us more conscious of our international obligations and more capable of sharing responsibility in world government. According to him the United States was more pro-League in its ideals during the period between the wars than were the League members themselves who accepted and played the balance-of-power game. America's ability to translate its ideals into practice and to collaborate with other nations in a program of international co-operation awaits the tests of the very near future.

Dr. Shaw's miscellany of essays are held together by his concern to demonstrate the intimacy of America's historical and contemporary relationship to the other nations of the world and their common problems. Geographically, the essays range over the globe but are less concerned with western Europe than one might expect. The author devotes several chapters to the consideration of the

Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Monroe Doctrine, disarmament and the League. The Washington Disarmament Conference he regards as expressive of the typical American policy of reasonableness and good-will in international relations.

Although the main emphasis of the book is on the analysis of historical events, the author ventures to elaborate one program for the future in his proposal to establish an international government of seas and islands. This government of the seas, whose members would be maritime nations, would be a supranational agency independent of the League and capable of paying its own way by a small tax on "insular" commerce. Besides controlling the Japanese mandates and other islands, it would by means of a relatively small international naval force, police the seas. National navies would be dismantled. This plan, thinks Dr. Shaw, is the practical solution of the Wilsonian ideal of the freedom of the seas. The world's answer to this proposal will soon be forthcoming. (CHARLES P. O'DONNELL)

WILLIAMS, BASIL. *Carteret & Newcastle: A Contrast in Contemporaries.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. vii, 240. $3.50.) A lifetime of research and writing in the era of the Whig supremacy supports this easily-read account of two important personalities of eighteenth-century England. The material was originally presented in the Ford Lectures at Oxford for 1921, but Professor Williams has rewritten the study in the light of the newer research up to 1940. The influence of the lectures is discernible in the interesting and attractive style of presentation. The text is supplemented by footnotes, almost entirely developed from documentary materials. It is not minimizing, however, to imply that these footnotes were included to give the professional touch, as it is evident on every page that the book is built out of Professor Williams' profound knowledge of eighteenth-century England.

The account of these two brilliant failures emphasizes the parallelism of their educational and social backgrounds as members of the landed nobility. Newcastle enjoyed greater advantages of wealth and earlier secured a council seat which Carteret had to earn by his diplomatic activity in Sweden. As these leaders matured their contrasting characteristics became more evident. Carteret always was possessed of a "grand policy" to maintain England's prestige, but due to his boldness and haughtiness, he was always without any party support to accomplish his aims. Picayune, self-abasing Newcastle, though never possessed of any statesmanlike view, became the "electioneer-in-chief of the Whig Party," for forty years was a member of the king's council. Extended accounts of party maneuvering and personal rivalries are presented for the period before Pitt's nationalist attitude lessened Newcastle's control over the weakening Whigs. The arrival of George III, with Bute as his adviser, foreshadowed the eclipse of Newcastle, when they employed his own methods to destroy his parliamentary support, and leave him shorn of power, prestige, and even pension. Carteret meanwhile without political power, had survived by the power of his ideas and his policy.

A reader might complain that the book is written in a vacuum of statecraft and diplomacy, with little reference to the economic and social transformation of England, even though Newcastle and Carteret appear to have been uninterested in these developments and themselves appear to be primarily interested in statecraft and politics. A more valid complaint is the small place given to America, and to the Empire, throughout the text. While Newcastle may not have fully appreciated either, his correspondence showed that he had to give them attention, if for nothing more than to fill colonial offices with good Whigs. Slight errors appear in such points as Massachusetts Bay not being given credit for the capture of Louisbourg Fortress (p. 174), and where the reference to the Additional Manuscripts should read 33073 (p. 19). These criticisms are relatively minor items, however, in the major contribution presented in this work, particularly the vividness of Professor Williams' character study of the Duke of Newcastle, for which English and American historians will be indebted to him. (Edward P. Lilly)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Introductory College Course in Civilization. Thomas C. Mendenhall (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

Church History and Secular History. James Hastings Nichols (*Church Hist.*, June).

Natural Law and the Nature of Man. Paul Ramsey (*Christendom*, Summer).

Juridical Lexicography and the Reception of Roman Law. Guido Kisch (*Seminar*, Vol. II, 1944).

In Quest of Sovereignty. Otto Kirchheimer (*Journ. of Politics*, May).

The Nation State. Alfred Cobban (*History*, Mar.).

Nation: The History of a Word. Guido Zernatto (*Rev. of Politics*, July).

Political Theory and the Pattern of General History. Eric Voegelin (*Amer. Pol. Science Rev.*, Aug.).

On the Preservation of Historical Manuscripts. Charles McLean Andrews (*William and Mary Quart.*, Apr.).

Incunabula in the Library of Congress. Frederick R. Goff (*Library of Congress Quart. Journal*, Jan.).

The Printed Bible: A Study in Bibliography. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M. Cap., (*Amer. Ecclesiastical Rev.*, Apr.).

Five Centuries of Prints Recently Acquired. A.B. (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, June.).

San Agustín, luz de Africa. Juan O'Brien (trans. into Spanish by Manuel Díaz de León) (*Abside*, July.).

Les Décrétales de Grégoire IX et le Code pio-bénédictin. Raymond Charland, O.P. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July).

St. Bernardine of Siena, Pillar of the Observance. Victor Mills, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, June).

Aristotle's Natural Theology. Bertrand J. Campbell, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

The Medieval Crisis of Logic and the Author of the *Centiloquium* Attributed to Ockham. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Saints' Lives Attributed to Nicholas Bozon. Part II, La vie sein Margaret. Mary R. Learned (*ibid.*).

Eros and Anteros. Robert V. Merrill (*Speculum*, July).

The Knighting Ceremonies in the Middle English Romances. Robert W. Ackerman (*ibid.*).

Andrew Holes: A Neglected Harbinger of the English Renaissance. Josephine Waters Bennett (*ibid.*).

Some Possible Sources of Mediaeval Conceptions of Virgil. John J. H. Savage (*ibid.*).

Imperial Diplomas for Menaggio and Comacina. Charles Edwin Odegaard (*ibid.*).

A New Fragment of Arator in the Bodleian. Neil R. Ker, E. A. Lowe, and A. P. McKinley (*ibid.*).

A Dante Note — Smeraldo. Vincenzo Cioffarri (*ibid.*).

Pseudo-Malachy and the Popes. John J. Driscoll (*Amer. Ecclesiastical Rev.*, June).

The Capuchins and Studies before Trent. Demetrius Manousos (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, May).

Capuchins at the Council of Trent. Celsus Repole (*ibid.*).

The Kingship of Christ according to St. Lawrence of Brindisi. Irvin Udulutsch (*ibid.*).

The Jew's Function in the Mediaeval Evolution of Economic Life. Guido Kisch (*Historia Judaica*, Apr.).

The Status of the Jews in the Middle Ages Considered from the Standpoint of Commercial Policy. Wilhelm Roscher, tr. by Solomin Grayzel (*ibid.*).

Nationalism and Autonomy among Eastern European Jewry. Kurt Stillschweig (*ibid.*).
The Significance of Luther's Earliest Extant Sermon. H. S. Bluhm (*Harvard Theological Rev.*, Apr.).
The Pekin Palace Church of the Jesuits. N. Burke-Gaffney (*Month*, July).
Democracy in the Making in China. H. G. Quaritch Wales (*Catholic World*, July).
China and the Vatican. Dom Thaddeus Yang, O.S.B. (*Catholic World*, Sept.).

EUROPEAN

The Unknown King, Louis XVI. Elizabeth S. Kite (*Records of the Amer. Catholic Histor. Soc.*, June).
Outre-manche, Reflections on France and Europe. Francis March (*Month*, May).
New Views upon the Borgias. J. H. Whitfield (*History*, Mar.).
The Future of Italy. Luigi Sturzo (*Commonweal*, July 21).
Italian Problems. Luigi Sturzo (*ibid.*, Sept. 8).
Is a Solution Possible in Spain? Alfredo Mendizabal (*ibid.*, July 28).
What Not to Do with Spain. Alfredo Mendizabal (*ibid.*, July 7).
Fulda, 744-1944. Romanus Rios, O.S.B. (*Dublin Rev.*, July).
Christina of Sweden. Marguerite Horan Gowen (*Records of the Amer. Catholic Histor. Soc.*, June).
Limited Warfare and the Progress of European Civilization, 1640-1740. John U. Nef (*Rev. of Politics*, July).
A Forerunner of Lenin: P. N. Tkachev. Michael Karpovich (*ibid.*).
John Tyssowski. Sister M. Neomisia Rutkowska (*Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, July).
Autochthonism of the Wends or Sorbo-Lusatzians. Francis Domański, S.J. (*ibid.*).
The White Ruthenian Problem in Eastern Europe. Jozef Lichtensztul (*ibid.*).
The Baltic Provinces, Some Historical Aspects and Perspectives. Hans Rothfels (*Jour. of Central European Affairs*, July).
Training for Citizenship in the Austrian Elementary Schools during the Reign of Francis I. R. John Rath (*ibid.*).
The German Exiles and the "German Problem." Kurt R. Grossmann and Hans Jacob (*ibid.*).
The Austrian Question at the Turn of the Twentieth Century. Irwin Abrams (*ibid.*).
Some Old Laws of the Danubian States. Vladimir Gsovski (*Library of Congress Quart. Journal*, Jan.).
Novgorod, Constantinople, and Kiev in Old Russian Church Architecture. Kenneth John Conant (*Slavonic and East European Rev.*, Aug.).
A Milestone in European History, the Danish Russian Treaty of 1562. Walther Kirchner (*ibid.*, Aug.).
Trends in Soviet Foreign Policy. George Vernadsky (*Yale Rev.*, Summer).
Church and State in Russian History. Serge A. Taneyew (*America*, July 1).
Russia — Pro and Con. Waldemar Gurian (*Commonweal*, Aug. 11).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Geoffrey of Montbray, Bishop of Coutances, 1049-1093. John Le Patourel (*Eng. Histor. Rev.*, May).
The Monk Solitary of Farne: a Fourteenth Century English Mystic. W. A. Pantin (*ibid.*).
The Members of Henry VIII's Whole Council, 1509-1527. William Huse Dunham, Jr. (*ibid.*).
The Early History of Werrington. H. P. R. Finberg (*ibid.*).
Matthew Cheker. N. Denholm-Young (*ibid.*).
Wolsey's Rule of the King's Whole Council. William Huse Dunham, Jr. (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Turbulent Career of Sir Henry de Bodrugan. A. L. Rowse (*History,* Mar.).

Great Britain and Napoleon, 1814-15. Charles Grant Robertson (*ibid.*).

Fr. Francis Willoughby Brewster, O.D.C. [last of the Discalced Carmelites in England]. H. Chadwick (*Month,* July).

A Monastic House of Studies [*concl.*]. Watkin Williams (*Pax,* Summer).

A Son of St. Vincent de Paul [Père Pouget, 1847-1933]. E. Polimeni (*ibid.*).

William Tyndale. W. E. Campbell (*Catholic World,* July).

The Marian Exiles — Denizens or Sojourners? Frederick A. Norwood (*Church Hist.,* June).

David Williams, Reformer. Charles F. Mullett (*ibid.*).

Catholic Education and the Norwood Report. Andrew Beck (*Month,* May).

The Surnames of Scotland, Their Origin, Meaning, and History. George F. Black (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library,* June, July, Aug.).

The Problem of "Silua Focluti" [St. Patrick's *Confessio* 23]. Ludwig Bieler (*Irish Histor. Stud.,* Sept.).

A Great Irish Missionary, Bishop Joseph Shanahan, C.S.Sp. Edward Leen, C.S.Sp. (*Studies,* June).

Sir Robert Kane, Life and Work. T. S. Wheeler (*ibid.*).

Patrick Byrne, Architect. C. P. Curran (*ibid.*).

Biographical Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Part X. Richard Hayes (*Studies,* June).

In Diebus Illis [Reverend John T. Lynch, pioneer Australian priest]. Part VI. John O'Brien (*Australasian Catholic Record,* Apr.).

AMERICAN

Franklin and the Duchess. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M. Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.,* May).

The Tunisian Consulate [John Howard Payne] [*cont.*]. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.,* June-July).

Vignettes of Maryland History. Part I. Raphael Semmes (*Maryland Histor. Mag.,* June).

Letters of Severn Teackle Wallis, 1816-1894. Frederick Down Scott, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Some Aspects of the Relations of the Government and German Settlers in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1683-1754. Part I. William Thomas Johnson (*Pennsylvania Hist.,* Apr.).

Early Maps of Pennsylvania. Homer Rosenberger (*ibid.*).

The Church of the Evangelists, Philadelphia. Edward Hawks (*Records of the Amer. Catholic Histor. Soc.,* June).

The Faith Crushed in England under Elizabeth Restored to Honor through French Recognition of an Independent America. Sister M. Mildred Ludes, R.S.M. (*ibid.*).

Feminism in Philadelphia, 1790-1850. Thelma M. Smith (*Penna. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.,* July).

Papers of the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery. Norman B. Wilkinson (*ibid.*).

John Boyle O'Reilly, 1844-1944. Brendan A. Finn (*Catholic World,* Aug.).

Poet, Patriot and Fighter [John Boyle O'Reilly]. A. J. Reilly (*Columbia,* Aug.).

Father Accursius Gaertner and the Year 1850 in the History of the Cincinnati Franciscans. Parts I and II. John B. Wuest (*Provincial Chronicle,* Fall and Winter, 1943).

Franciscan Missions among the Navajo Indians. Part III. Emmanuel Trockur, O.F.M. (*ibid.,* Fall).

The Truth about Cincinnati's First Library. Dorothy V. Martin (*Ohio State Archaeological and Histor. Quart.,* July).

An Early Tale of the Falls of St. Anthony. John T. Flanagan (*Minnesota Hist.,* June).

The Czechs in Cedar Rapids. Part II. Martha E. Griffith (*Iowa Journal of Hist. and Politics,* July).

Notes on Some Early Huguenot Settlements in Virginia. Mrs. Patricia Holbert Menk (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, July).

Mormonism in the "Burned-over District" [western New York]. Whitney R. Cross (*New York Hist.*, July).

A Political Interpretation of Mormon History. G. Homer Durham (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, June).

The Development of the Early Ministry. Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr. (*Anglican Theological Rev.*, July).

A Protestant Critique of Anglicanism. Paul Lehmann (*ibid.*).

Notes on American Hymnody. Howard Chandler Robbins (*ibid.*).

Dr. Cutler Entertains the Clergy. Mary Kent Davey Babcock (*Histor. Mag. of Protestant Episcopal Church,* June).

George Keith. James A. Muller (*ibid.*).

The New England Company, the First Missionary Society. John Wolfe Lydekker (*ibid.*).

A Correction [to "Documents for the History of the New Mexico Missions in the 17th Century," III, 1]. France V. Scholes (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, July).

Memoirs of Marian Russell [*concl.*]. Mrs. Hal Russell (*Colorado Mag.*, May).

The Voyage of Louis Jolliet to Hudson Bay in 1679. Jean Delanglez, S.J. (*Mid-America*, July).

The Contribution of the Jesuits to the Exploration and Anthropology of South America. Alfred Métraux (*ibid.*).

El Rio del Espiritu Santo [*concl.*]. Jean Delanglez, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Le centenaire de l'arrivée des Oblats à Bytown (Ottawa), 1844-1944 [*cont.*]. Henri Morisseau, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July).

The Political Scene in Mexico: Sinarchism. Richard Pattee (*America,* Aug. 12, Aug. 19).

The Future of Our Inter-American Relations. *Idem* (*Columbia,* Sept.).

Mexican Compromise. Camille Cianfarra (*Sign,* Aug.).

Spain's Investment in New Mexico under the Hapsburgs. Lansing S. Bloom (*Americas.* July).

Some Remarks concerning Andre Thevet. Manoel da Silveira Cardozo (*ibid.*).

The Franciscan Contribution to Mexican Culture. Eduardo Enrique Rios (*ibid.*).

Literary Contributions of Catholics in Nineteenth Century Mexico. Francis Borgia Steck (*ibid.*).

A Good Neighbor Policy of the Sixteenth Century: The Spanish Missionaries. David Rubio (*ibid.*).

Our Debt to the Franciscan Missionaries of New Mexico. J Manuel Espinosa (*ibid.*).

The Franciscan Provinces of Spanish North America. Marion Habig (*ibid.*).

In Quest of Serrana. Maynard Geiger (*ibid.*).

Coopératisme latin aux Amériques. Rodolphe Laplante (*Culture,* June).

El Excmo. y Rvmo. Sr. Dr. D. Fernando Ruiz y Solórzano, Arzobispo de Yucatán. Juan B. Buitron (*Christus,* July).

Reminiscencias constitucionales. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*ibid.*, Aug.).

Don Enrique Sanchez Paredes. Joaquín Máruez Montiel, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Alonso Zuazo. Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas (*Filosofía y Letras,* Apr.).

South American Cartographic Treasures. Lawrence Martin (*Library of Congress Quart. Journal,* Jan.).

La Contemporaneidad de don Juan Donoso Cortés. Ricardo Pattee (*Universidad Católica Bolivariana,* Feb.).

Sucesos y recuerdos de la Independencia en Chihuahua. Francisco R. Almada (*Boletín de la Sociedad Chihuahuense de Estudios Históricos,* June).

La necesidad de un concordato en el Perú. Carlos Pareja Paz Soldán (*Revista de la Universidad Católica del Perú,* Sept., 1943).

La Iglesia, el Estado y la Acción Católica en el Perú. Christóbal de Losada y Puga (*ibid.*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bailey, Thomas A., *Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. xii, 381. $3.00.)

Beard, Charles A. and Mary E., *A Basic History of the United States.* (New York: Garden City Publishing Co. 1944. Pp. x, 508. 69¢.)

Blau, Joseph Leon, *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1944. Pp. viii, 167. $2.25.).

Brodie, Bernard, *A Guide to Naval Strategy.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. xii, 314. $2.75.) Lieutenant Brodie has completely revised his *A Layman's Guide to Naval Strategy,* published in August, 1942, in the light of recent developments in sea warfare. The new edition carries redrawn maps and charts. The popularity of this volume is attested by the fact that this is the eighth printing, with 56,000 copies now in print.

Butterfield, H., *The Englishman and His History.* Vol. 19 of Current Problems Series edited by Sir Ernest Barker. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1944. Pp. x, 142. 3*s* 6*d*; $1.10.)

Cassidy, Frank P., *Molders of the Medieval Mind. The Influence of the Fathers of the Church on the Medieval Schoolmen.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1944. Pp. viii, 194. $2.00.)

Crawford, W. Rex, *A Century of Latin-American Thought.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1944. Pp. 320. $3.50.)

Crittenden, Christopher, and Doris Godard, *Historical Societies of the United States and Canada. A Handbook.* (Washington: American Association for State and Local History. 1944. Pp. xi, 261. $1.75 to members; $2.50 to non-members.)

Dunlap, Leslie W., *American Historical Societies, 1790-1860.* (Madison: Privately Printed. 1944. Pp. ix, 238. $3.50.)

Elbogen, Ismar, *A Century of Jewish Life.* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 1944. Pp. xliii, 814. $3.00.)

Farrelly, Sister M. Natalena, *Thomas Francis Meehan (1854-1942).* Monograph Series. Vol. XX. (New York: U. S. Catholic Historical Society. 1944. Pp. 139.)

F. D. F., *Solio Seraphico no Brasil.* (Petropolis: Vozes de Petropolis. 1926. Pp. 72.)

Flick, Ella Marie, *Beloved Crusader, Lawrence F. Flick, Physician.* (Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co. 1944. Pp. 390. $3.50.)

Forbes, Allyn Bailey (Ed.). *Winthrop Papers, 1638-1644.* Vol. IV. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1944. Pp. xl, 531.)

Freitas, Frei Diogo, O.F.M., *Elencho biographico de religiosos antigos da Provincia Franciscana da Immaculada Conceição do Brasil.* (Petropolis: Vozes de Petropolis. 1931. Pp. 406.)

Gershoy, Leo, *From Despotism to Revolution, 1763-1789.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1944. Pp. xvi, 355. $4.00.)

Goebel, Julius, Jr., *Law Enforcement in Colonial New York, a Study in Criminal Court Procedure (1664-1776).* (New York: Commonwealth Fund. 1944. Pp. xxxix, 867. $5.00.)

Goenner, Sister Mary Ellen, *Mary-Verse of the Teutonic Knights.* The Catholic University of America Studies in German, Vol. XIX. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1943. Pp. xvii, 246. $2.50) This dissertation furnishes a useful sketch and bibliographical references on the history of the *Marienritter.* It is a valuable contribution to the history of mediaeval devotion. The author's comment rather deftly aids the reader in following her many extracts from the poems.

Goodchild, Sister Mary Antonine, O.P. *Gregorian Chant for Church and School.* (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1944. Pp. ix, 131. $1.00.)

Haller, William, and Godfrey Davies, *The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653.* (New York: Columbia University Press in co-operation with the Huntington Library and Art Gallery. 1944. Pp. vi, 481. $6.50.)

Harcourt-Smith, Simon, *Cardinal of Spain. The Life and Strange Career of Alberoni.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1944. Pp. xiv, 282, xv. $3.50.)

Hermens, Ferdinand A., *The Tyrants' War and the Peoples' Peace.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1944. Pp. xiii, 249. $2.75.)

Hinkson, Pamela, *Golden Rose.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1944. Pp. 371. $2.50.)

Jones, Howard Mumford, *Ideas in America.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1944. Pp. xi, 304. $3.00.)

Kelty, Mary G., and Sister Blanche Marie, *Gifts of Other Lands and Times.* (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1944. Pp. vii, 433. $1.32.) This volume is the latest reader in American Life: A Series of Histories for Catholic Schools. It deals with the story of man's development from the Stone Age to the beginning of modern times and is intended for students in the middle grades. The book is profusely illustrated.

Mahieu, Robert G. (Ed.), *Michel Chevalier. Lettres sur l'Amérique du Nord.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the Institut Français de Washington. 1944. Pp. xx, 51. 50¢.) The Institut Français de Washington has issued another of its brochures giving extracts from the writings of various Frenchmen on the United States. This time it is from five letters of Michel Chevalier (1806-1879). In the Introduction Robert G. Mahieu offers a sketch of Chevalier's life with a bibliography of his writings.

Marcham, Frederick George, *The British Commonwealth, an Experiment in National Self-government and International Co-operation.* Cornell University Curriculum Series in World History, No. 5. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1944. Pp. 98. 40¢.)

Maryknoll Mission Letters. Volume I, 1944. (New York: Field Afar Press. 1944. Pp. viii, 55. 50¢.) Once more South and Central America take the lead in the latest addition to the letters of the Maryknollers published twice a year by the motherhouse, although eleven letters from China are printed against the fourteen from below the Rio Grande. These letters breathe the spirit of optimism amidst total war, a spirit which has become part of the Maryknoll tradition.

Moll, Aristides A., *Aesculapius in Latin America.* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co. 1944. Pp. xii, 639. $7.00.)

Mowat, Charles Loch, *East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784.* University of California Publications in History. Volume 32. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 237. $2.00.)

North, Robert G., S.J., *The General Who Rebuilt the Jesuits.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1944. Pp. xii. 292. $3.00.)

Pepler, Conrad, O.P., *Lent, a Liturgical Commentary on the Lessons and Gospels.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1944. Pp. x, 406. $4.00.)

Proceedings of the Eighty-eighth Convention of the Catholic Central Verein of America and the Twenty-seventh Convention of the National Catholic Women's Union. (St. Louis: Office of the Catholic Central Verein of America. 1944. Pp. 200.) This volume of speeches, resolutions, reports, etc., of the two organizations covers the meeting held at Springfield, Illinois, August 21-24, 1943.

Rider, Fremont, *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library. A Problem and Its Solution.* (New York: Hadham Press. 1944. Pp. xiii, 236. $4.00.)

Röwer, Frei Basílio, O.F.M., *Páginas de história Franciscana no Brasil.* (Petropolis: Editora Vozes Ltda. 1941. Pp. 660.)

————, *A ordem Franciscana no Brasil.* (Petropolis: Editora Vozes Ltda. 1942. Pp. 158.)